Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

3.6.'95

Division HD6664
Section H85
Shelf
Number

THE CONFLICTS
OF
CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

THE CONFLICTS
OF
CAPITAL AND LABOUR

HISTORICALLY AND ECONOMICALLY CONSIDERED.

BEING A

HISTORY AND REVIEW OF THE TRADE UNIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN,

SHOWING

THEIR ORIGIN, PROGRESS, CONSTITUTION, AND OBJECTS, IN THEIR VARIED POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMICAL, AND INDUSTRIAL ASPECTS.

BY

GEORGE HOWELL, M.P.,

FELLOW OF THE STATISTICAL SOCIETY,

Author of the "Handy-Book of the Labour Laws," etc. etc.

SECOND AND REVISED EDITION, BROUGHT DOWN TO DATE.

"Be just, and fear not."—*Henry VIII.*, Act iii., Scene 2.

"Nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice."—*Othello*, Act v., Scene 2.

London:

MACMILLAN AND CO.

AND NEW YORK

1890.

CHARLES DICKENS AND EVANS,
CRYSTAL PALACE PRESS.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The first edition of this work was published about twelve years ago—in 1878. In revising it for reissue I have been forcibly struck with the enormous changes which have taken place as regards industrial questions. So great have they been that the work has had to be practically rewritten. Then trade unions were denounced in the press, on the platform, in the pulpit, and in parliament; not occasionally, but constantly, persistently, and virulently. Many of the attacks to which allusion is made in the text appeared during the year in which the book was being written. One specimen only is preserved of the rancorous onslaughts on trade unionists so common in 1877 and in previous years. Now trade unions are bepraised and commended by all sorts and conditions of men. Their influence is sought socially and politically, and combination is preached as the one great panacea for all kinds of social evils, even by the Lords' Committee on "Sweating."

It might, perhaps, be thought egotistical were I to claim some share in effecting this change in public opinion. Yet this somewhat singular coincidence happened, that attacks

which continued up to the very date of the publication of this work, then almost suddenly ceased; and some of the charges levelled against trade unions, trade unionists, and their leaders, have seldom been repeated to this day. I attribute some of this change to the fact that, for the first time, these charges were systematically and in detail exposed and refuted, the whole economy of trade unionism being therein explained. This shows that the opponents erred mainly from lack of knowledge, and not from malice prepense. But I do not assume all the merit, only a share. Other agencies had been, were, and are still at work. The Inquiry by the Royal Commission, in 1867–69, helped to clear away many misconceptions. Mr. Frederic Harrison, Mr. John Morley, and others assisted in the work. The Annual Trades Union Congresses have done much in the same direction. The presence in parliament, since 1874, of some men closely identified with trade unions, and the legislation which followed their advent into the House of Commons, still further assisted in disarming opposition, and in removing prejudices from the public mind. More recent political changes have contributed to the completion of the change, which had been going on for years, relating to trade unions and their work.

The severe condemnation of force and coercion, to be found in various parts of the book, may sound antiquated to-day, when intimidation is excused and violence is palliated by a section calling themselves the "New Trade Unionists"; force being even preached by another section, called Socialists, both of whom are excused in the press. In 1878 my condemnation was considered weak and insufficient; now, I suppose, it will be regarded as uncalled for, and possibly impertinent. I abate

not a jot or tittle of the condemnation of force and violence pronounced by me in 1877. Liberty is not lop-sided; the freedom to combine carries with it the corresponding freedom to abstain from combining, if a man thinks fit. Force is no remedy in the organisation of labour any more than it is in the organisation of the State. For thirty-five years of my life I have fought for the liberty to combine, and for the repeal of the last vestige of repressive laws against combination. I will resist any substitution of brute force by men in combination, as contrary to that liberty of action for which I have ever contended. Unionists have no more right to compel men to belong to a trade union than employers have to restrain workmen from joining or remaining in the union. In either case it is a violation of constitutional, social, and individual right, and in the end is ruinous to those who exercise it.

The "New Trade Unionists" condemn the "friendly benefits," which are a conspicuous feature in the modern trade union of the better class. They would have the unions return to that older form of combination, for "trade purposes" only, which the officials and leaders, and ultimately the members, were led to discard. Experience had shown that unions founded solely on that basis were weak and inefficient; they were unable to bear the strain of successive struggles. The experience of the last forty years has shown how immeasurably superior the present form of the trade union is, based upon the principle of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and adopted by many of the leading unions of the country. Those who have adopted that model can boast of being among the noblest institutions of the country, as

associations for self-help and mutual help, by associative effort —unique in benefits, influence, and power, beyond comparison in the world. To abandon that policy would be to return to the infancy of trade unions, to the ruder and cruder stages of their development; to the period when they were under the ban of the law, when they could not freely and openly organise, and when their funds were unprotected and at the mercy of any unscrupulous officer who was dishonest enough to embezzle them. The more thoughtful trade unionists are not likely to be led astray after this fashion; they recognise the value of an institution which has done so much for them during the last half-century.

The one valuable lesson which trade unions have taught and enforced is: That labour has its rights as well as its duties; and that capital has its duties as well as its rights. Formerly we heard nothing except the rights of labour on the one hand, and the rights of capital on the other. Rights and duties cannot be divorced; the one is involved in the other. The recognition of this fact has led to the establishment of Boards of Conciliation for dealing with labour disputes. Those Boards may not have been as successful as could be desired; but they have done, and are doing most excellent work in several industries. Newer developments and a wider field are opening to them; moderation, prudence, and a determination, on both sides, to do what is right, will ensure industrial peace and progress. The old motto of trade unionists is: "A fair day's work for a fair day's wage." Older still it was: "The labourer is worthy of his hire." The equitable proportion of work to wages must be settled by workmen and employers. This

phase constitutes labour and capital in debate. If properly conducted, antagonism will be minimised, and the more acute phases will be largely diminished, if not entirely prevented. Wrongful claims will be abandoned, and rightful dues will be conceded, when fair-minded men on both sides sit at the same table, on an equal footing, to discuss the terms and conditions of employment, with the view of settling them upon an equitable basis.

Labour and capital in alliance is less easy of realisation, although some progress has been made in this direction also. The simpler form of industrial partnership has been tried, and has succeeded in many cases; but it has had its failures. Industrial co-operation has largely extended, in the more difficult field of production, as well as in distribution. When workmen are engaged mutually in production, they begin to realise some of the difficulties of so employing capital as to ensure a return for the money invested, as well as good wages during the period of production. Only the more thoughtful and thrifty of the workmen have as yet voluntarily undertaken the responsibilities of self-employment, by associative effort and capital. Some of the "new trade unionists" talk wildly on these subjects. They think that they have discovered how to get rid of capitalists, abolish profits, and do away with wages, and yet promote the welfare of the masses and the prosperity of the country. Something of this might be accomplished by the co-operation of labour and capital, for the mutual good of each, and for the common good of all. But these men are not co-operators. They denounce trade unions and co-operation alike, when it suits their purpose. They look to the State for aid.

But history shows, especially industrial history, that self-reliance, self-help, by individual effort, and mutual help, by associative effort, are the only practicable means whereby the condition of the people can be permanently improved.

GEORGE HOWELL.

Whitsun Week, 1890.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

In preparing the present work for the press the objects which I have endeavoured to keep steadily in view are threefold: (1) To supply the fullest information with regard to the history, organisation, constitution, and working of trade unions, in all their multifarious aspects. (2) To furnish an authoritative exposition of the leading features of those unions, their chief characteristics, their aims and ends, and also the methods or means by which they seek to attain them. (3) To give a trustworthy explanation of some of the alleged restrictive rules by which they are said to be governed, together with a refutation of many of the utterly wild theories and reckless statements regarding them, which too often find a place even in the writings of those who are more or less friendly to their general objects, but whose opinions are founded on inadequate information, supplied often by one side only, with regard to the nature of those unions, the rules by which they are governed, their management, and the scope of their action.

Numerous books have been published on special branches of the subjects treated of in this volume, but, as a rule, they

have been written by men who have had to obtain their information second hand, who have picked up a fact here and there, without being able to see their connection with other facts to them unknown, and who consequently have often mistaken some incidental feature for the main principle upon which these unions are based; and, therefore, however well intentioned the writers may have been, their works are incomplete, as a description of the purposes of trade unions, or inaccurate as to the mode of conducting them; the data being inexact, the conclusions drawn are necessarily unreliable.

This, however, does not apply to all the subjects here discussed; some phases of the question have been treated with marked ability by competent writers, but the papers are mostly detached, they are scattered here and there, and are only to be found in high-priced journals, which, after they are once read, are too frequently thrown aside and forgotten. In the following pages many of these valuable fragments are laid under contribution, either by quotation or condensation, so as to preserve their essence. There is also a large amount of trade union literature in existence, in the form of pamphlets, tracts, speeches, reports, addresses, balance-sheets, and much that is useful in the "special organs," or class newspapers, which have from time to time been devoted to their interests; all of these, as well as official reports and "blue books," have been consulted by the present writer, in order that the work may be made as full and complete in itself as possible.

The first part of the work, viz., "Guilds," has been treated in an exhaustive and able manner by Dr. Brentano, in his learned and outspoken essay, in five parts, prefixed to the

valuable work on "English Gilds," edited, with notes, by the late Mr. Toulmin Smith, and published by the Early English Text Society. Many differences of opinion may be observed between the learned doctor of Bavaria and the able editor of the "Ordinances of the Gilds"; it has been my endeavour to give such a concise and careful abstract of the history of these ancient precursors of the modern trade unions as will present an accurate view of the main features of those highly interesting societies in Early Britain, and in the Middle Ages, when they were so fully developed and organised. The term "Gild" is used by the English Text Society. Modern trade unionism cannot be properly understood, or rightly appreciated, except by a careful study of their early prototypes, the English guilds. The whole of this part of my subject has been based on Dr. Brentano's essay, but I have compared his statement, with the charters and ordinances given by Mr. Toulmin Smith, and with the notes and introduction by Miss Lucy Smith, which also differ in some respects from the views enunciated by Dr. Brentano; this portion has been supplemented with further particulars from other sources.

The treatise which has attempted to deal with the modern phase of trade unionism, in its most complete form, is "The Trades' Unions of England," by M. le Comte de Paris, edited by Mr. Thomas Hughes, Q.C., published in 1869. It is not altogether accurate, but it is a most creditable production, and especially when we consider that it was written by a foreigner. There are a few quaint errors in the book, but the tone is good and wholesome throughout, very different from that found in other books written by some Englishmen.

The volume, "Work and Wages," by Lord Brassey, deals

only in a general sense with the question of trade unions, but it contains much valuable matter, especially with regard to the cost of labour both at home and abroad; the work did good service to the working men of England, for which they cannot be too thankful.

The elaborate work "On Labour," by Mr. W. T. Thornton, is more ambitious; it deserves careful study on account of the new aspects which he has presented of some of the doctrines of political economists; but he has accepted and endorsed many exploded theories and statements in regard to trade unions, which a little further research would have shown him to be unfounded. Some of these are examined and exposed in various parts of the present work; taken, however, as a whole, Mr. Thornton deserves great credit for his labours; the tone of his book is healthy, vigorous, and, in so far as he saw the question, impartial.

The most valuable contributions to the literature of trade unions are the papers contributed to the *Fortnightly Review*, by Mr. Frederic Harrison, they are marked by great ability, originality, and research, and have contributed not a little to the altered tone in the English press with regard to those institutions. Mr. J. M. Ludlow has also given valuable assistance towards the elucidation of many knotty points in the labour controversy, by articles in *Macmillan's Magazine*, the *Fortnightly Review*, and other papers, while in the little book entitled the "Progress of the Working Classes," the joint production of Mr. Ludlow and Mr. Lloyd Jones, there is a mass of useful and interesting facts and historical matter, touching their social advancement, not to be found elsewhere.

Many of the authorities consulted, and freely used in the

preparation of this volume, will be found in the Appendix; this has been done to avoid constant repetition in the text, and an extensive use of footnotes. It is hoped that this general acknowledgment will suffice.

The scope of the present work is sufficiently indicated by its title, and the table of contents; if any point of importance has been omitted, or inadequately explained, it is due to oversight, and not to any desire to "slur over," or keep in the background, any material issue, or to abridge anything which could throw a light on the several questions brought under review, or the principles involved in their discussion.

In presenting this work to the public the author is aware that there may be many deficiencies in matter and manner, but he has endeavoured to be impartial; he has taken great care to be exact; his object has been to give actual, ascertained, and well authenticated facts. These have sometimes been obtained with great difficulty, as a few of the unions do not indulge in the luxury of publicity. He will be found supporting the workmen where he believes them to be right, and deciding against them, when and where he thinks they have been in the wrong.

In many parts of the book the sentiments expressed are oftentimes mere matters of opinion; the conclusions arrived at may therefore be at variance with those held by members of trade unions, or they may differ from those held by the masters; at other times they may be opposed to both; the divergence from the views of other writers on similar questions will be often still more apparent; in all cases the only thing I can ask is for a candid verdict, after a careful examination of the book as a whole.

Whatever may be said with regard to trade unions, either as to their policy, their objects, or the means which they employ, one great fact cannot be ignored, namely, that they wield a vast power, socially and politically, and, whether for good or for evil, it is daily increasing. They are, moreover, public institutions in Great Britain to-day, exercising great authority by reason of their extent, their wealth, their organisation, and the numbers within the pale of their influence, and they are as deeply rooted in the minds and affections of the working people as almost any institution in the country. It is useless to abuse them, to put them down is impossible; the only sensible way of dealing with them has been done by legally enfranchising them; they are now protected by law, as well as being amenable to the law, and their future action will show that this policy is as wise as it is just.

G. H.

March, 1878.

GENERAL CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	v
	PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION, 1878	xi
I.	GUILDS.—THEIR ORIGIN, ESSENCE, AND HISTORY:	
	Part I. The Origin and Essence of Guilds . .	1
	„ II. Religious and Social Guilds	8
	„ III. The Merchant-Guilds and Town-Guilds .	16
	„ IV. Craft-Guilds	27
II.	TRADE UNIONS, THEIR ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND DEVELOPMENT:	
	Part I. Their Origin—Successors of Guilds . .	68
	„ II. Trades subject to the Statute, 5 Eliz. c. 4 .	71
	„ III. Trades Incorporated by Charter . . .	84
	„ IV. Trades free from Restriction either by Statute or Charter	91
	„ V. The rapid growth of Trade Unions during the present century	101
III.	THE OBJECTS, AIMS, CONSTITUTION, AND GOVERNMENT OF TRADE UNIONS	128
IV.	POLITICAL ECONOMY AND TRADE UNIONS	181
V.	APPRENTICES AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION	216
	II. Technical Education	251

CHAP. PAGE

VI. I. Piece-Work. II. Hours of Labour. III. Systematic Overtime:

I. Piece-Work 257

II. Hours of Labour 269

III. Systematic Overtime 283

VII. Two Phases of Trade Unionism: I. Coercion, Intimidation, and Rattening. II. Picketing, considered in its Legal, Political, Social, and Personal Aspects:

I. Intimidation 292

II. Picketing 305

VIII. Restraint of Trade.—Restrictive Rules of Trade Unions 325

IX. I. Strikes — Their Objects, Cost, and Results. II. Foreign Competition:

I. Strikes—Their Objects, Cost, and Results . . 346

II. Foreign Competition 365

X. Labour in Coalition.—I. Federation of Trade Unions. II. Trades' Councils. III. Trades Union Congresses:

I. Federation of Trade Unions 393

II. Trades' Councils 403

III. Trades Union Congresses 410

XI. Labour and Capital in Consultation and Debate.—Conciliation and Arbitration in Trade Disputes:

I. Boards of Conciliation 433

II. Boards of Arbitration 445

XII. Labour and Capital in Alliance.—I. Co-operation. II. Industrial Partnerships, or Profit-Sharing:

I. Co-operation—Distributive and Productive . . 454

II. Industrial Partnerships, or Profit-Sharing . . 465

CHAP. PAGE

XIII. Friendly Societies in their relation to Trade Unions 470

XIV. Conclusion—General Review, Present Position and Future of Trade Unions 481

APPENDICES.

I. Trade Unions—Tables of Members, Income, Expenditure, Balance in hand, Payments for Benefits, etc., (*a*) Amalgamated Society of Engineers, (*b*) Steam-Engine Makers, (*c*) Boiler-Makers and Iron-Shipbuilders, (*d*) Ironfounders, (*e*) Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners 496

II. Table of Wages and Average Earnings for a Series of Years 514

III. Specimen of Schedule or Strike Form to be filled up when application is made to the Executive for permission to Strike 520

IV. Votes of Trade Unionists on the Eight Hours System 522

V. Abstract of Returns of Systematic Overtime worked in Government Factories, 1884 to 1890 . . . 524

VI. Tables of Dates, Places, Representation, Income, Expenditure, and Balances in hand of the Twenty-two Trades Union Congresses, 1868 to 1889 . . 525

VII. Foreign Competition. Abstract of Returns, 1877 to 1890, of chief groups of aggregate Exports of Manufactured Articles by Foreign Countries . 528

VIII. List of Chief Works and Authorities, Parliamentary Papers and Returns, Magazine Articles, etc., referred to and consulted in the preparation of this Work 532

SYNOPTICAL CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

GUILDS.—THEIR ORIGIN, ESSENCE, AND HISTORY.

PAGE

PART I. *The Origin and Essence of Guilds*:—§ 1. England, the birth-place of Guilds; of Scandinavian origin—§ 2. The family the basis of all early communities—§ 3. The family primarily responsible for offences and offenders—§ 4. Kinship lost or merged in wider social relations—§ 5. Artificial alliances formed for further protection—§ 6. Growth of "towns," contests for civic rights—§ 7. Rise of "craftsmen" in the towns—§ 8. Formation of Frith-Guilds—§ 9. Frank-pledge recognised by law—§ 10. Principle of mutuality the basis of Guilds—§ 11. Influence of Christianity on the early Guilds—§ 12. Three oldest Guild-statutes: Abbotsbury—§ 13. Exeter—§ 14. Cambridge—§ 15. Characteristic features of these Guilds—§ 16. Records and documents referred to as authorities, etc. . . 1

PART II. *Religious and Social Guilds*:—§ 1. Origin of Religious Guilds—§ 2. Capitularies of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, 858; Guilds of the laymen—§ 3. Guilds common in the Middle Ages—§ 4. Name of such Guilds, Religious or Social?—§ 5. Organisation and objects of Guilds: (1) Religious exercises—§ 6. (2) Christian charity—§ 7. (3) Education—§ 8. (4) Feasts of celebration—§ 9. (5) Representation of religious plays—§ 10. (6) Performance of secular plays and pastimes—§ 11. (7) Mutual benefit, and insurance—§ 12. Regulations as to admission to Guild—§ 13. Guild liveries at feasts—§ 14. Income of Guilds—§ 15. Constitution of Guilds—§ 16. Membership of the Guild—§ 17. Conduct of members—§ 18. Meetings of members—§ 19. Guilds of the clergy; ordinances against misconduct; admonitions as to the conduct of priests—§ 20. Guilds of the Kalenders; admission of laymen—§ 21. Major and minor Guilds—§ 22. The Reformation and religious Guilds—§ 23. Confiscation of the property of Guilds—§ 24. Dissolution of the colleges, Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; object and extent of the "confiscation"—§ 25. Danish Guilds; partial revival of Guilds; friendly societies an offshoot of the Guilds—§ 26. Evidence of analogy, Sir Frederick Eden—§ 27. Mr. J. M. Ludlow confirms this view 8

PAGE

PART III. *The Merchant-Guilds and Town-Guilds*:—§ 1. Origin of Town-Guilds—§ 2. Possession of land a condition of citizenship—§ 3. Merchants in England—§ 4. Guilds in France—§ 5. Similar ones in Germany—§ 6. Murder of a Guild-brother avenged on a king—§ 7. Growth of the Merchant-Guild—§ 8. The Patricians—§ 9. Contests for power—§ 10. English Guilds and the aristocracy—§ 11. Guilds of London—§ 12. Union of Guilds, Berwick—§ 13. Continental Guilds more political—§ 14. Danish Guilds—§ 15. Condition of membership—§ 16. Separation into classes—§ 17. Craftsmen excluded from merchant-Guilds—§ 18. Wholesale traders only—§ 19. Monopoly of power, how used—§ 20. Oppression of the poor—§ 21. Resistance of the craftsmen—§ 22. Persecution—§ 23. Victory of the craftsmen, how used—§ 24. Transfer of power from old burghers to Craft-Guilds—§ 25. Companies of London, origin of—§ 26. The grocers, Lord Mayor—§ 27. Recognition of the new power by the king—§ 28. Effects of the struggle in England and on the Continent—§ 29. Denmark—§ 30. Effects of the Reformation 16

PART IV. *Craft-Guilds*:—§ 1. Evidence of the early power of Craft-Guilds—§ 2. Population of the towns, eleventh century; divisions stated—§ 3. Rise of the handicraftsmen as a class—§ 4. The burghers or old freemen—§ 5. The bondsmen—§ 6. Origin of Craft-Guilds—§ 7. Causes which led to the establishment of Craft-Guilds—§ 8. Constitution of Craft-Guilds—§ 9. First Craft-Guilds—the weavers—§ 10. Continental Craft-Guilds—§ 11. Rise and progress of the early Craft-Guilds—§ 12. Organisation of Craft-Guilds—§ 13. Opposition of the old burghers to Craft-Guilds—§ 14. Contests for supremacy in the towns; weavers—§ 15. Election of masters or wardens of the Guilds—§ 16. The triumph of the Craft-Guilds—§ 17. Industrial policy of the Craft-Guilds—§ 18. Policy of Craft-Guilds on the Continent—§ 19. Objects and constitution of Craft-Guilds—§ 20. Periodical meetings and government of Craft-Guilds—§ 21. Duties of Wardens of the Craft-Guilds—§ 22. Punishment of refractory members; Rattening—§ 23. Every craftsman must belong to a Guild—§ 24. Income of Guilds—§ 25. Rules of the Guilds—§ 26. Right to trade or exercise the craft; apprenticeships—§ 27. Regulations as to tools, quality of work, etc.—§ 28. Hours of labour, fasts, feasts, and holidays—§ 29. Ruinous competition—§ 30. Further regulations—§ 31. Refusal to work with a non-member—§ 32. Conduct of Guild brothers towards each other—§ 33. Religious character of the Craft-Guilds—§ 34. Union of craftsmen belonging to similar trades; confederation—§ 35. Relation between masters and journeymen—§ 36. No actual working class, as at present, then existed—§ 37. Rise of capitalist class—§ 38. Degeneracy of the Craft-Guilds set in—§ 39. Ordinance requiring returns of the Guilds—§ 40. Rise of journeymen as a class—§ 41. The plague, 1348–49—§ 42. Statute of Labourers, 23 Edw. III., 1349; Statute of Labourers, 25 Edw. III., 1351;

PAGE

Statute of Labourers, 12 Richard II., 1388; Statute of Labourers, 13 Richard II., 1390; Statute of Labourers, 7 Henry IV., 1406—§ 43. Regulation of wages and prices by statute—§ 44. Organised efforts to raise wages; clothworkers—§ 45. Building trades—§ 46. Rise of other journeymen fraternities; prohibition by the city authorities—§ 47. Protection decreed to the journeymen—§ 48. Government of the Craft-Guilds, restrictive and protective—§ 49. Degeneracy of the Guilds accelerated by capitalists' regulations—§ 50. Legal enactments with the object of restricting their authority—§ 51. Continental fraternities; Germany and France—§ 52. Continental regulations—§ 53. Transfer of power to the richer members—§ 54. Opposition to the change—§ 55. German Guilds; regulations—§ 56. Black lists and strikes—§ 57. Origin and cause of disputes—§ 58. Statutory regulations, Edw. VI. c. 15; German code, 1577—§ 59. London apprentices—§ 60. Origin of Trade Unions traced to the Craft-Guilds—§ 61. General condition of the workmen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—§ 62. Memorial of the printers; case and proposals—§ 63. Decay of the Craft-Guilds—§ 64. Appropriation of Guild funds by the Crown—§ 65. Causes of the final overthrow of the Craft-Guilds—§ 66. Their final extinction in France, Germany, and England . 27

CHAPTER II.

TRADE UNIONS, THEIR ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND DEVELOPMENT.

PART I. *Their Origin—Successors of Guilds*:—§ 1. Trade Unions the successors of Guilds—§ 2. Evidence of similarity to the old Guilds—§ 3. Conditions under which they first arose—§ 4. Combinations in the building trades—§ 5. Statute of Apprentices, 5 Eliz. c. 4.—§ 6. Apprenticeships made compulsory—§ 7. Persons who might take apprentices—§ 8. Limitation as to numbers—§ 9. Journeymen, period of hiring—§ 10. Hours of labour—§ 11. Wages to be assessed—§ 12. 1 James I. c. 6—§ 13. Results to the workmen—§ 14. Duty of magistrates—§ 15. Effects of restriction; interpretation of Act limited—§ 16. How Trade Unions originated 68

PART II. *Trades subject to the Statute*, 5 *Eliz.* c. 4:—§ 17. Woollen manufactures; early combinations; earlier regulations, Edw. VI. and Mary, 5 Eliz. c. 4; report of committee of House of Commons, 1757—§ 18. Combinations prohibited, 12 Geo. I. c. 34; rate of wages fixed, but not enforced—§ 19. Revolt of the weavers, victory of the workmen—§ 20. Transition state of woollen trades—§ 21. Small masters and domestic industry; system of apprenticeships universal—§ 22. Practice in Yorkshire—§ 23. Domestic manufacture—§ 24. Apprentice, how taught; working of the system; regularity of employment—§ 25. Stagnation of trade and losses—§ 26. Amicable relations of masters and men—§ 27. Cloth-halls, the market for the sale

PAGE

of goods—§ 28. Introduction of machinery—§ 29. Merchant clothiers—§ 30. Division of labour—§ 31. Growth of large capitalists; growth of operative class—§ 32. Apprenticeship system relaxed and discontinued—§ 33. Employment of women and children—§ 34. Apprenticeships, as applied to masters, relaxed and abolished—§ 35. Formation of a trade society; institution at Halifax, objects of—§ 36. Combinations suppressed by 39 Geo. III. c. 81.—§ 37. Irregularity of employment; fluctuations in trade and in wages—§ 38. Deterioration of small masters—§ 39. Trade societies formed under cloak of friendly societies—§ 40. Chief object, the prosecution of masters; petitions of masters, March 14, 1803, May 9, 1803, April 24, 1804—§ 41. Counter measures by small masters and workmen —§ 42. 43 Geo. III. c. 136; Suspension of laws—§ 43. Independent action of the workmen—§ 44. Institution formed in 1803—§ 45. Objects of the Institution; apprentices—§ 46. No one to learn two trades at once; further complaints—§ 47. Provision in case of sickness or death—§ 48. Contributions and management of the Institution—§ 49. Master manufacturers leave the Institution—§ 50. Workmen coerce the masters—§ 51. Acts of intimidation by workmen—§ 52. Parliamentary committee, 1806; report—§ 53. Report favours the repeal of 5 Eliz. c. 4—§ 54. Shipwrights' Society—§ 55. The Hatters' Society—§ 56. The Tailors' Society 71

PART III. *Trades Incorporated by Charter*:—§ 57. Incorporated trades—Framework knitters; apprentices—§ 58. Petition of the men refused—§ 59. Revolt of the men—§ 60. Great distress among the workmen—§ 61. New bye-laws ordained—§ 62. Manufacturers refuse to obey—§ 63. The Company appeal to the workmen—§ 64. The Stockingers' Trade Society—§ 65. Return a Member to parliament—§ 66. Workmen petition parliament; committee appointed; confirmatory evidence given; motion lost—§ 67. Workmen again petition parliament—§ 68. Evidence before the committee as to frame-rents, etc.—§ 69. Workmen buy materials—§ 70. Distressed state of workmen—§ 71. Bill introduced for regulations of trade—§ 72. Counter petitions by employers, another committee appointed—§ 73. Fate of the Bill—§ 74. Great rioting of workmen; masters' promises—§ 75. Continual oppression of the workmen—§ 76. Another appeal to parliament unsuccessful—§ 77. The cutlers of Sheffield—§ 78. Compositors and printers 84

PART IV. *Trades free from Restriction either by Statute or Charter*:—§ 79. Calico-printers' apprentices; evidences as to the conduct of employers—§ 80. Deductions from wages—§ 81. Effects on the work-people—§ 82. Calico-printers' Society; rules and objects —§ 83. Appeal to parliament—§ 84. Committee appointed, 1802; report—§ 85. Bill of Mr. Sheridan thrown out—§ 86. The Cotton trades—§ 87. The Silk trades; report, 1818—§ 88. Spitalfields Acts, 13 Geo. III. c. 68, 32 Geo. III. c. 44,

PAGE

51 Geo. III. c. 7.—§ 89. Price lists formed—§ 90. The "Good Intent" Society formed—§ 91. Employers' Society—§ 92. Effects of 5 Eliz. c. 4.—§ 93. Another parliamentary inquiry, 1813—§ 94. Repeal of the Statute of Apprentices by 54 Geo. III. c. 96—§ 95. Effects of the repeal of 5 Eliz. c. 4.—§ 96. Further petitions—§ 97. Opinions of Mr. Pitt as to the condition of the work-people—§ 98. Growth of combination and combination laws—§ 99. Secret combinations—§ 100. Effects of the combination laws; riots and injury to property—§ 101. Outrages, 1819 to 1823 91

PART V. *The rapid growth of Trade Unions during the present century:* —§ 102. Position of the workmen under the new system—§ 103. Growth of the factory system, its effects—§ 104. Objects of the early unions—§ 105. Origin of the combination laws—§ 106. Early organisations crude and imperfect—§ 107. Statement lists and arbitration—§ 108. Statute of 40 Geo. III. c. 106 to suppress combinations of workmen—§ 109. Prosecutions of workmen—§ 110. Conduct of workmen under persecution—§ 111. Parliamentary inquiry, 1824—§ 112. Report of the committee—§ 113. 5 Geo. IV. c. 95, 1824—§ 114. Object and policy of statute—§ 115. Spread of combination; new inquiry, 1825—§ 116. Fresh legislation, object and extent—§ 117. 6 Geo. IV. c. 129—§ 118. Legislature of 1825—§ 119. Condemnation of 6 Geo. IV. by W. Nassau Senior—§ 120. Protests of the workmen, 1834; Dorchester labourers—§ 121. Strikes, 1829 to 1837—§ 122. Parliamentary inquiry, 1838—§ 123. Abstract of evidence—§ 124. Progress of the unions, 1834 to 1843—§ 125. Inauguration of the National Association of United Trades, 1845—§ 126. Prosecution for conspiracy, etc.—§ 127. Great strikes, Engineers, 1852; Preston operatives, 1853–4; Tin-plate workers, 1855; Friendly Societies' Acts, 1854—§ 128. Parliamentary inquiry, 1856—§ 129. Builders' strike and lock-out, 1859—§ 130. Allegations of tyranny and outrage against the unions—§ 131. Select Committee, 1865; contract of service and of hiring—§ 132. Royal Commission, 1867–8–9, to inquire into organisation and rules of trade societies, etc.—§ 133. Result of the inquiry, Act of 1871; development of the unions during last twenty years—§ 134. Lessons conveyed by the history of labour struggles. 101

CHAPTER III.

THE OBJECTS, AIMS, CONSTITUTION, AND GOVERNMENT OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. Definition of a Trade Union; objects of Trade Unions; doctrine of restraint of trade—§ 2. The right of combination—§ 3. Trade Unions voluntary associations—§ 4. Its voluntary principle should not be impugned—§ 5. Right of the workman to fix the price of his own labour—§ 6. Right of employers to fix the price they will pay—§ 7. Workmen weak in isolation—

PAGE

§ 8. Value of combination—§ 9. Opponents of combination—§ 10. Effects of restrictive legislation—§ 11. The true basis of combination; "Reign of Law;" spirit of association; its operation as a special force; the limit of its power—§ 12. The basis of Trade Unions; constitution—§ 13. Trade benefits and friendly benefits—§ 14. Table of contributions and benefits—§ 15. Out-of-work fund—§ 16. Drunkenness or other misconduct—§ 17. Assistance in cases of distress—§ 18. In aid of the rates—§ 19. Amounts paid during 1875–6 and 1888–9; since 1867; since 1851—§ 20. Effects of out-of-work benefit on workmen—§ 21. Out-of-work fund confounded with strike pay—§ 22. Travelling relief, or tramp money—§ 23. Strike pay—§ 24. When strike pay is allowed—§ 25. Strike allowance; amounts paid—§ 26. Steps to be taken before a strike can take place—§ 27. Local privileges—§ 28. Amounts spent in strikes—§ 29. Arbitrary action of the unions—§ 30. Formation of a Trade Union—§ 31. Working rules—§ 32. Bye-laws—§ 33. Constitution of the union—§ 34. General unions—§ 35. Tables showing extent, wealth, and power of the unions—§ 36. Further statistics of general unions amongst miners—§ 37. Other general unions—§ 38. Agricultural labourers—§ 39. Unskilled labour; Dockers' Union; railway servants, etc., etc.—§ 40. Other labourers' unions—§ 41. Local unions—§ 42. Trade Unions essentially an English institution—§ 43. Grants of money to other trades—§ 44. Trade Unions non-political and non-sectarian—§ 45. Exceptions; reform movements; Reform League—§ 46. County franchise—§ 47. Merchant seamen—§ 48. Growing tendency towards political action—§ 49. Trade Unions social and industrial—§ 50. Organisation and government of Trade Unions; qualification of members; election of members; method of election; proposal of members; procedure at elections; personal assent to the rules—§ 51. Initiation of new members—§ 52. Government of the union—§ 53. Committee of management—§ 54. Officers of Trade Unions—§ 55. Funds of Trade Unions—§ 56. Funds; recent protection of; Russell Gurney's Act, 31 and 32 Vict. c. 116; Trade Union Acts, 1871 and 1876—§ 57. Books and accounts; audit of; (1) branch accounts; (2) general accounts; trustees; prosecutors in case of embezzlement—§ 58. Salaries of officials—§ 59. Table of salaries in some of the largest unions—§ 60. General cost of management; rent of offices and of rooms for branch meetings—§ 61. Cost of printing and postage—§ 62. Delegations—§ 63. Investment of funds—§ 64. Employment of funds—§ 65. Public and social effects of Trade Unions; (1) discipline; (2) systematic force; (3) social restraint; (4) inculcate thrift; (5) encourage emulation; (6) educational influence—§ 66. Scope of their influence—§ 67. Popular recognition of Trade Unions—§ 68. New Trade Unionism; disparagement of the Friendly Society element 128

CHAPTER IV.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND TRADE UNIONS.

PAGE

§ 1. Political economy *v.* humanity and philanthropy — § 2. Christianity *v.* political economy—§ 3. Doctrine with regard to a science of production—§ 4. Theories of political economists subject to change—§ 5. Assumptions of political economists and their consequences—§ 6. Scope and meaning of political economy—§ 7. Definition of the science and its objects—§ 8. Questions which the science embraces—§ 9. Nature of wealth and laws of production—§ 10. Definition of wealth not settled —§ 11. Economical sources of wealth—§ 12. Nature the source of all wealth—§ 13. Labour the agent in production— § 14. In what consists the wealth of a country—§ 15. Capital defined; its uses—§ 16. Economical definition of labour and its results—§ 17. Relationship between capital and labour— § 18. Labour not a commodity—§ 19. The price of labour; by whom shall it be fixed, the seller or the purchaser?—§ 20. Basis of prices, cost of production, etc.—§ 21. The value of labour—§ 22. The price of commodities; how to be estimated —§ 23. Competition, its province and economical aspects— § 24. Unlimited competition; its tricks and results—§ 25. Deterioration of British trade—§ 26. Buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market — § 27. The wages of labour — § 28. Limitation of supply in the case of commodities — § 29. Limitation of supply in the case of labour — § 30. Partial application of the theory of supply and demand—§ 31. Over-population—§ 32. Destruction of machinery—§ 33. Limitation of production by shorter hours of labour—§ 34. The wage-fund theory—§ 35. Whence arises the wages fund?—§ 36. Wages, rate of real and nominal— § 37. The actual value of wages—§ 38. Action of Trade Unions in regard to the wages of labour—§ 39. Trade Unions do not fix a maximum—§ 40. Neither do they try to enforce uniformity —§ 41. Minimum rate of wages; attempts to fix it by the unions—§ 42. Current rate of wages—§ 43. Fluctuations in wages, evils of—§ 44. Remedies of the unions, the relief of members—§ 45. Effect of fluctuations of wages on employers; effects on the public—§ 46. Duty of political economists—§ 47. What determines the price of labour?—§ 48. Difficulties of adjustment, the individual or the union—§ 49. Strikes originate through hasty conduct of members rather than of leaders —§ 50. Officials and leaders not promoters of strikes—§ 51. Antagonistic theories of political economy in Germany—§ 52. Changes in the tone of public opinion, and in the attitude of political economists towards labour—§ 53. Its failure in regard to social and industrial questions 181

CHAPTER V.

APPRENTICES AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

§ 1. Apprenticeships; three parties to be consulted, (1) employer, (2) apprentice, (3) workman—§ 2. Interests of the public considered—§ 3. Origin and history of apprenticeship, 5 Eliz. c. 4. —§. 4. Local customs; contests for limitation and restriction—§ 5. Repeal of the statute by 54 Geo. III. c. 96—§ 6. Indoor apprentices; indentures; premiums—§ 7. Harsh treatment; parish apprentices—§ 8. Enlistment in the army as a means of escape—§ 9. Improved position of apprentices—§ 10. Change from domestic manufacture to factory life—§ 11. Opposition to boy labour, origin and cause of, etc.—§ 12. Reasons for imposing restrictions—§ 13. Freedom of labour; right to live —§ 14. Good craftsmen; importance of, etc.—§ 15. Cheap labour; employers' view—§ 16. The interests of the workmen; wages, etc.—§ 17. Difficulty of reconciling conflicting interests § 18. Abolition of apprenticeships; effects of, etc.—§ 19. Bad work, cause of, not always the workman—§ 20. Decline of British trade; reasons for it—§ 21. Unnatural competition and its results—§ 22. Division of labour; use of machinery, etc., etc.—§ 23. The policy of limitation and restriction by Trade Unions—§ 24. The actual practice in its operation and results: (*a*) The Iron trades; grouped—§ 25. Amalgamated Engineers—§ 26. Steam-engine Makers—§ 27. Ironfounders—§ 28. Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders—§ 29. Iron-workers and Steel-workers—§ 30. Birmingham and Sheffield hardware trades—§ 31. (*b*) The Building trades—§ 32. Masons, English and Scottish — § 33. Bricklayers — § 34. Carpenters — § 35. Plasterers—§ 36. Plumbers—§ 37. Painters and Decorators—§ 38 (*c*) Printing and Bookbinding trades; London Society of Compositors — § 39. Provincial Typographical Association—§ 40. Machine-minders — § 41. Lithographic Printers — § 42. Bookbinders—§ 43. (*d*) Domestic trades; Shoemakers—§ 44. Tailors — § 45. Hatters — § 46. (*e*) Shipping trades; shipwrights—§ 47. (*f*) Glass-making trades—§ 48. (*g*) Coachmakers—§ 49. (*h*) Tobacco trades—§ 50. (*i*) Jewellery and Watch-making trades — § 51. (*j*) Cabinet-makers and Upholsterers—§ 52. (*k*) Ceramic wares, Pottery, etc.—§ 53. (*l*) Factory operatives—§ 54. (*m*) Miscellaneous trades and occupations—§ 55. General conclusions : (1) Statutory restrictions abolished—§ 56. (2) Indentures no longer customary—§ 57. (3) The term of apprenticeship variable—§ 58. (4) Premiums not now usual—§ 59. (5) Resistance of Trade Unions to the abolition of apprenticeships—§ 60. (6) The action of employers the cause of the decline of the apprenticeship system—§ 61. (7) Machinery and division of labour; effects of, as regards the term of servitude—§ 62. (8) Limitation of the number of apprentices by journeymen—§ 63. (9) Who teaches the apprentice, employer or workman ?—§ 64. (10) Rules as to limitation and restriction not enforced by the unions—§ 65. (11) Primary

PAGE

objects of such rules; good craftsmen—§ 66. (12) Domestic apprentices; abolition of—§ 67. (13) Outdoor apprentices or boy journeymen—§ 68. (14) Contracts of apprenticeship obligatory whether verbal or by indenture—§ 69. (15) No restriction as to obtaining employment—§ 70. (16) No prohibition as to entering a Trade Union—§ 71. (17) Certificates of character not required—§ 72. (18) Hours of labour for apprentices—§ 73. General conclusions; summary of 216

II. *Technical Education:*—§ 74. Technical education; its importance—§ 75. South Kensington Museum; classes and lectures—§ 76. Society of Arts; technological examinations—§ 77. The City of London; Companies and Guilds—§ 78. London charities and Polytechnics—§ 79. Legislation and local bodies—§ 80. Province of technical education—§ 81. Its effects with regard to the term of apprenticeships, etc., etc.—§ 82. Its value; preliminary work; Government aid—§ 83. Action of London Guilds, technical colleges, etc. 251

CHAPTER VI.

I. PIECE-WORK. II. HOURS OF LABOUR. III. SYSTEMATIC OVERTIME.

I. *Piece-Work:*—§ 1. Piece-work; false notions with regard to the action of Trade Unions—§ 2. Difficulties of the universal adoption of the piece-work system—§ 3. Distinctions to be drawn; sub-contracts—§ 4. Payment of wages at public-houses—§ 5. The gang, or butty system—§ 6. Piece-work, properly so called, defined—§ 7. Attempts of Trade Unions to restrict piece-work—§ 8. Effects of piece-work on the workman—§ 9. Piece-work as it affects the price of labour—§ 10. Quality of work under the piece-work system—§ 11. Distinction drawn with regard to trades in which the combined work of many is required to produce a completed article—§ 12. In some trades piece-work not suitable—§ 13. Piece-work not an unmixed good—§ 14. Evils of day-work and piece-work contrasted—§ 15. Payment by results; false notions in regard to, etc.—§ 16. Honest and conscientious work, application of the theory—§ 17. Trading and working classes compared—§ 18. Carlyle and Ruskin, teachings of, in regard to earnest work 257

II. *Hours of Labour:*—§ 19. General tendency to shorter hours of labour; large firms—§ 20. Smaller firms and offices—§ 21. Effects of a reduction of the working hours—§ 22. Equally beneficial to workmen as to trades-people—§ 23. Reasons why it should be extended to workmen—§ 24. The ten-hour day, early efforts to reduce the working hours; Act of Henry VI.—§ 25. Further legislation, reign of Henry VIII. § 26. The average working day in the olden time—§ 27. Efforts to effect a reduction in the hours of labour, nineteenth century; factory legislation—§ 28. Early Factory Acts, commissions of inquiry, etc.—§ 29. Further factory legislation, 1825, 1833 to 1874—§ 30. Efforts outside parliament—§ 31. Aspirations for

PAGE

an eight-hour day—§ 32. Legislative restriction of hours of labour, Continental workmen—§ 33. Efforts of British workmen and the results—§ 34. British workmen generally opposed to State interference—§ 35. Demand for State interference of recent date—§ 36. Socialist demands considered—§ 37. Miners and the eight-hours day—§ 38. Government employés—§ 39. Railway employés—§ 40. Short hours and higher wages 269

III. *Systematic Overtime:*—§ 41. Overtime, systematic and general—§ 42. Irregular hours; effects on the workmen—§ 43. Effects on employers; increase of wages by means of overtime not a fair method—§ 44. Disadvantage to workmen and employers—§ 45. Systematic overtime injurious—§ 46. Occasional overtime; case stated as regards masters and men—§ 47. Extent of overtime—§ 48. Government factories—§ 49. Numbers employed—§ 50. Hours worked—§ 51. Overtime worked restricted, 1887–1890—§ 52. Responsibility for overtime—§ 53. Workmen's greed for overtime 283

CHAPTER VII.

TWO PHASES OF TRADE UNIONISM: I. COERCION, INTIMIDATION, AND RATTENING. II. PICKETING, CONSIDERED IN ITS LEGAL, POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND PERSONAL ASPECTS.

I. *Intimidation:*—§ 1. Coercion, comments by the newspaper press—§ 2. Misapprehension and misrepresentation; deputation to the Home Secretary, March 22, 1872—§ 3. Coercion, definition of; substitution of the word "compel" for "coerce"—§ 4. The demands of the workmen misunderstood—§ 5. Intimidation; memorial to the Home Office, 1872; letter to Mr. Gladstone, 1873—§ 6. Repeal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871—§ 7. Personal violence never sanctioned or excused—§ 8. General opinion that outrage and violence were the outcome of the unions—§ 9. Commission of inquiry asked for in 1866—§ 10. Sheffield Town Council, 1866—§ 11. Deputations to the Home Office, 1866; secrecy and publicity—§ 12. Royal Commission appointed, 1867; outrages at Sheffield and Manchester; extent of these outrages—§ 13. Rattening, definition of, by Mr. John Wilson; definition of, by report of the Royal Commission, 1869—§ 14. The law as to rattening—§ 15. General results of the inquiry; Mr. F. Harrison—§ 16. Evidence of non-union men—§ 17. Conclusion to be drawn from the evidence as to alleged tyranny of the Trade Union—§ 18. Result of the commission; Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871—§ 19. Mistaken policy of the legislature—§ 20. Legislation of 1875; labour laws—§ 21. Beneficial results of these laws; instances, the masons at Bristol; the shoemakers at Bethnal Green—§ 22. Cases of intimidation comparatively rare; repressive laws mischievous and ineffectual; workmen have no right to restrict the liberty of another—§ 23. The railway strikes in America—§ 24. Equality of the laws, 1875—§ 25. Rattening a crime—§ 26. Duty of unionists as to rattening. 292

PAGE

II. *Picketing:* — § 27. Picketing, importance of the subject stated—§ 28. Misconception as to its character—§ 29. Nature of picketing defined — § 30. Practice and means stated—§ 31. Duty of pickets—§ 32. Extent of their powers—§ 33. Committee only have power to deal with cases—§ 34. Object of picketing—§ 35. Picketing liable to abuse—§ 36. Case against the practice overstated—§ 37. Charges not justified by the evidence; coercion infrequent—§ 38. Grounds of objection to picketing; answers to objections; (1) Union workmen; (2) Non-union workmen; (3) Employers; coercion by masters § 39. The document system; engineering trades—§ 40. Master builders of London; prosecution of the union leaders; employers' black lists—§ 41. Better feeling prevails than formerly; retaliation not now so often resorted to—§ 42. London Tailors' strike, 1867—§ 43. Conduct of the tailors' pickets repudiated; sympathy with the officers of the union; liberation of the defendants—§ 44. The prosecution an attempt to put down the union; opinions as to the conduct of the prosecutors—§ 45. Evils arising from picketing should be repressed—§ 46. A class must not be persecuted because of the acts of a few—§ 47. Hasty words and even coarse expressions do not always imply intimidation—§ 48. Is picketing necessary? Is it useful and desirable? Are the abuses part of the system and inseparable from the practice? Answers: (1) It is not generally necessary; (2) The practice is not useful as a means; (3) The abuses are not a necessary part of the system—§ 49. The law with regard to picketing; cases stated—§ 50. Engineers at Erith—§ 51. Shoemakers at Bethnal Green—§ 52. Bricklayers at Doulton's, Lambeth—§ 53. The law as to picketing as laid down by the judges; Hammersmith case; cabinet-makers; alteration of the law; the law is now general, not special—§ 54. Social pressure—§ 55. What a workman may or may not do—§ 56. Relative rights and duties of one workman towards another; the recorder's charge, London—§ 57. Baron Bramwell, Manchester, 1876 — § 58. Baron Huddleston, Maidstone, 1876—§ 59. The limits beyond which picketing must not go . . 305

CHAPTER VIII.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE.—RESTRICTIVE RULES OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. Rules in restraint of trade—§ 2. Strictures by Mr. Thornton in his book "On Labour"—§ 3. Mr. Thornton's advice to Trade Union leaders—§ 4. Unions do not interfere with individual liberty—§ 5. Coercion not sanctioned by Trade Union leaders—§ 6. Extent and scope of inquiry as to alleged malpractices—§ 7. Bricklayers laying bricks with both hands—§ 8. Meaning of the allegation and its application—§ 9. Bricklayers not to lay more than a given number—§ 10. Chasing—§ 11. Alliance of, with brickmakers as to machine-made bricks—§ 12. Further alliance not to lay bricks made under certain conditions—§ 13. Employment of men from other districts, limitation of—

PAGE

§ 14. Rules as to foremen—§ 15. One bricklayer, one labourer —§ 16. Division of labour; employment of unskilled men— § 17. Carpenters not to do bricklayers' work—§ 18. Walking time, meaning of—§ 19. Masons' rules; working stone at the quarries, etc.—§ 20. Labourers' rules; number of bricks to be carried—§ 21. Going up one ladder, down another—§ 22. Opposition to an influx of unskilled labour—§ 23. Antagonism to non-unionists—§ 24. Employment of women and children—§ 25. Case against the unions overdrawn—§ 26. Misrepresentation, sample of; *The Fountain*—§ 27. Some restrictions still retained which are not commendable—§ 28. Opposition to new methods of work abortive, and doomed to fail 325

CHAPTER IX.

I. STRIKES—THEIR OBJECTS, COST, AND RESULTS. II. FOREIGN COMPETITION.

I. *Strikes—Their Objects, Cost, and Results:*—§ 1. Outcome of the present relationship of capital and labour—§ 2. Objects of strikes defined—§ 3. Are they justifiable?—§ 4. Cost of strikes considered—§ 5. Cause of strikes—§ 6. Does the end justify the means?—§ 7. Do they permanently raise wages?—§ 8. Influence of Trade Unions on wages—§ 9. Action of the unions on special industries; shipwrights of London—§ 10. Cost of coal, and wages of miners—§ 11. Iron-workers and ironmasters—§ 12. Importation of foreign workmen—§ 13. Building operatives, London and Manchester— § 14. Conduct of masters and their agents—§ 15. Results of importation of foreign workmen—§ 16. Attitude of the workmen; coercion—§ 17. Interference of the police—§ 18. Consequences of importation of foreign workmen—§ 19. Strikes against apprentices, non-union men, and unskilled labour— § 20. Are strikes successful?—§ 21. Are they peculiar to working men? Threatened strike on the Bench—§ 22. Mr. Ayrton; the Treasury and Kew Gardens 346

II. *Foreign Competition:*—§ 23. Action and influence of Trade Unions—§ 24. Meaning of foreign competition—§ 25. Monopoly of trade and commerce by England—§ 26. Are we being driven out of foreign markets, and beaten in markets at home?—§ 27. British workmen able to hold their own—§ 28. Development of import and export trade of Great Britain—§ 29. The scare of foreign competition only in abeyance—§ 30. Tables of imports and exports from 1700 to 1852, inclusive—§ 31. Comparisons of increase since 1853: (*a*) aggregates of imports and exports; (*b*) net imports and exports of British and Irish merchandise—§ 32. Excess of imports, and ratio of foreign and colonial trade—§ 33. Relative growth of foreign compared with British trade as exemplified by the United States—§ 34. Exports of British machinery, etc.: (*a*) quinquennial averages of exports; (*b*) of iron and steel manufactures—§ 35. Exports of cotton goods: quinquennial averages, quantities, prices, and

PAGE

total values—§ 36. Woollen trades: imports of wool, growth of, etc.—§ 37. Shipping trades, foreign bounties, action of Trade Unions—§ 38. Imports of foreign manufactured articles from the United States, cotton, clocks and watches, iron and steel, joinery and other goods—§ 39. Belgium, total imports from, and of specified articles—§ 40. France, total imports from, and of specified articles—§ 41. Foreign exports in the aggregate: (*a*) cotton goods; (*b*) woollen goods; (*c*) silk manufactures; (*d*) iron and steel manufactures; (*e*) general manufactures, specific articles; influence on these exports and on competition by Trade Unions—§ 42. Causes of decline in trade, alternate seasons of high pressure activity, and of comparative stagnation—§ 43. Effects of exports of shoddy and inferior goods upon foreign countries, and upon our colonies—§ 44. Other causes, political, financial, and commercial, foreign loans, Stock Exchange transactions, bogus companies, and the like. —§ 45. Manner and extent of interference by Trade Unions with British trade considered—§ 46. Limitation of production, coal-mining, etc.—§ 47. Capacity and cost of production, English and foreign—§ 48. Textile trades, and England, Germany, etc. —§ 49. Growth of British trade not to be measured merely by exports—§ 50. Accumulations of capital, 1861-75—§ 51. Estimated total capital of the country in 1875—§ 52. Accumulation of capital 1875-85—§ 53. British workmen not chargeable with having ruined British commerce, or driven trade from this country 365

CHAPTER X.

LABOUR IN COALITION.

I. FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS. II. TRADES' COUNCILS. III. TRADES UNION CONGRESSES.

I. *Federation of Trade Unions*:—§ 1. Federation of Trade Unions; dread of by the public — § 2. How viewed by employers — § 3. Federation of employers, 1873—§ 4. Project of federation not new—§ 5. Early attempts, London, 1846—§ 6. Sheffield, 1865; rumours as to the Sheffield outrages; the scheme abortive; dissolution of the association—§ 7. London Working Men's Association, 1867—§ 8. Revival of the idea of federation, 1873-4-5—§[9. Predicted ruin as the result of federation—§ 10. Partial federation possible in cognate trades—§ 11. Difficulties in the way of federation—§ 12. English trade in no danger from federation—§ 13. Federations of employers; national, of associated employers, 1873—§ 14. Partial federations—Building trades, coal-mining, iron and steel industries, cotton trades, engineering trades, etc.; new federation of engineering and shipbuilding trades, 1889—§ 15. Formation of federation of workmen of the engineering and shipping trades, etc.—§ 16. Constitution and objects of the federation—§ 17. Societies federated and their policy—§ 18. Federations of mine-owners and miners—§ 19. National federation of all the trades, action of the Trades Union Congress, and International federation . 393

PAGE

II. *Trades' Councils*:—§ 20. Trades' Councils not a federation; scope of their action—§ 21. Their special object and work—§ 22. Constitution of Trades' Councils and general objects; (1) voluntary in character, (2) in payments, (3) smallness of contributions; proposed increased payments—§ 23. Action of general unions towards Trades' Councils—§ 24. Formation of Trades' Councils, delegate meetings, not always restrictive in character—§ 25. Functions of Trades' Councils, (1) collection of funds—§ 26. (2) Investigation of causes, etc. of disputes, (3) guardians of the funds of the unions—§ 27. Disputes between one union and another—§ 28. Action of Trades' Councils in regard to general public questions—§ 29. Political action of Trades' Councils—§ 30. Numerical strength of Trades' Councils, (*a*) in 1876–77, (*b*) in 1889—§ 31. Payment of officials, the late George Odger—§ 32. Future work, social and political; technical education; Dr. Corfield's lectures; socialistic propaganda 403

III. *Trades Union Congresses*:—§ 33. Institution and objects of Trade Union Congress—§ 34. Position of the trades at date of first Congress—§ 35. Causes which led to their establishment, etc.—§ 36. First Congress, Manchester, 1868—§ 37. Second Congress, Birmingham, 1869—§ 38. Third Congress, London, 1871—§ 39. Fourth Congress, Nottingham, 1872—§ 40. Fifth Congress, Leeds, 1873—§ 41. Sixth Congress, Sheffield, 1874—§ 42. Seventh Congress, Liverpool, 1875—§ 43. Eighth Congress, Glasgow, 1875—§ 44. Ninth Congress, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1876—§ 45. Tenth Congress, Leicester, 1877—§ 46. Eleventh Congress, Bristol, 1878—§ 47. Twelfth Congress, Edinburgh, 1879—§ 48. Thirteenth Congress, Dublin, 1880—§ 49. Fourteenth Congress, London, 1881—§ 50. Fifteenth Congress, Manchester, 1882—§ 51. Sixteenth Congress, Nottingham, 1883—§ 52. Seventeenth Congress, Aberdeen, 1884—§ 53. Eighteenth Congress, Southport, 1885—§ 54. Nineteenth Congress, Hull, 1886—§ 55. Twentieth Congress, Swansea, 1887—§ 56. Twenty-first Congress, Bradford, 1888—§ 57. Twenty-second Congress, Dundee, 1889—§ 58. International Trades Union Congresses, 1883, 1886, and 1889—§ 59. Nature, constitution, character, and objects of the Congresses—§ 60. Labours of Trades Union Congresses; legislative record, 1868 to 1890—§ 61. Social advancement: promotion of members to seats in parliament, to official positions, and to seats on local bodies, etc.—§ 62. Summary of cost: (*a*) Income and expenditure, Congress fees; (*b*) of the Parliamentary Committee—§ 63. Early pioneers; Death's doings in the ranks of the earlier members of Congresses 410

CHAPTER XI.

LABOUR AND CAPITAL IN CONSULTATION AND DEBATE.

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION IN TRADE DISPUTES.

I. *Boards of Conciliation*:—§ 1. Value of conciliation, and obstacles in the way of its adoption—§ 2. Material or brute

PAGE

force *v.* reason and argument—§ 3. Trade disputes differ from bargains between buyers and sellers of commodities—§ 4. Legislative attempts to establish Courts of Conciliation—§ 5. Changed attitude of employers; experiments in the iron and coal industries—§ 6. Irregular modes of settling disputes by conferences pending a dispute—§ 7. Institution of North of England Board of Conciliation and Arbitration; its work and results—§ 8. Sliding scale arrangements in the iron and coal trades; results of—§ 9. Dockers' strike; improvised committee and arbitration—§ 10. Strike of miners, 1890; arrangements as to future disputes—§ 11. London Chamber of Commerce; initial steps—§ 12. Conciliation scheme of London Chamber of Commerce; report of Conciliation Committee—§ 13. Objects of the committee—§ 14. Constitution of committee and first board 433

II. *Boards of Arbitration*:—§ 15. Boards of arbitration, their objects and powers—§ 16. Constitution and province of such boards—§ 17. Awards should be accepted and binding—§ 18. Obstacles to arbitration, suspicion and prejudice—§ 19. Absence of definite principle as basis upon which to arbitrate—§ 20. Employers and workmen best judges as to basis—§ 21. Growth of better feeling between employers and employed—§ 22. Position of "Leaders" as to conciliation and arbitration—§ 23. Improved relations between employers and employed—§ 24. Repudiation of awards infrequent; Act of 1872—§ 25. Proposal for Parliamentary Consultative Committee by Mr. W. Mather, M.P. 445

CHAPTER XII.

LABOUR AND CAPITAL IN ALLIANCE.

I. CO-OPERATION. II. INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIPS, OR PROFIT-SHARING.

I. *Co-operation—Distributive and Productive*:—§ 1. Co-operation as a preventive to strikes—§ 2. Definition and scope of co-operation—§ 3. As applied to distribution. § 4. Its limitation and results—§ 5. Co-operative stores *v.* retail dealers—§ 6. Management and extent of stores, evidence of trading capacity—§ 7. Thirty years of co-operative progress—§ 8. Co-operative production—§ 9. Influence on wages, hours of labour, etc.—§ 10. Lessons taught by co-operative production—§ 11. Effects of such efforts on the Labour Question—§ 12. Disastrous effects of a few failures, more easily remembered than successes; examples of latter—§ 13. Co-operative Printing Society, twenty-one years' work—§ 14. Boot and shoe industries, and other examples—§ 15. Review of co-operative production, at Co-operative Congress, 1890 454

II. *Industrial Partnerships, or Profit-sharing*:—§ 16. Conditions of successful working—§ 17. Experiments of the principle already made—§ 18. Investments by employés in trading firms—§ 19. Later instances of profit-sharing: South Metropolitan Gas Works, Peto Brothers, etc.—§ 20. Maison Leclaire system—§ 21. Recent opposition to profit-sharing by the New Trade Unionists; capital and labour in alliance 465

CHAPTER XIII.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES IN THEIR RELATION TO TRADE UNIONS.

PAGE

§ 1. Mistaken ideas respecting relationship of Trade Unions to Friendly Societies—§ 2. Distinction to be drawn between the two forms of association—§ 3. Origin and development of Benefit Clubs and Friendly Societies—§ 4. Earlier attempts to suppress combinations led to formation of Trade Unions under cloak of Friendly Society—§ 5. Growth of Friendly Societies, legislative recognition—§ 6. Deposit of rules of Trade Union under Friendly Societies Act, 1854, for the protection of their funds—§ 7. Consolidation Act, 1875—§ 8. Extent, wealth, and benefits of Friendly Societies—§ 9. Points of contact and divergence in relation to Trade Unions and Friendly Societies—§ 10. Fundamental distinctions between the two forms of association—§ 11. Separation of Trade Union trade and benefit funds—§ 12. Recognition of Trade Unions as lawful corporate bodies, whatever their aims—§ 13. Registration of rules by Trade Unions 470

CHAPTER XIV.

CONCLUSION—GENERAL REVIEW, PRESENT POSITION AND FUTURE OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. General review and position of Trade Unions—§ 2. Dangers of vast organisations considered; monopoly of power—§ 3. Repeal of Combination Laws; right of association, its influence—§ 4. Extended action and influence of Trade Unions—§ 5. Causes which led to extended sphere of action, and results—§ 6. Examples of extended operations: (*a*) special, pertaining to labour; (*b*) general and political—§ 7. Recent action; Dundee Congress, 1889—§ 8. General achievements of Trade Unions; popular progress—§ 9. Official recognition; Royal Commission on depression in trade, extracts from report—§ 10. Sweating Committee, House of Lords—§ 11. International Conference at Berlin, 1890—§ 12. Action of municipal bodies (London School Board and London County Council) as to wages, etc.—§ 13. Increased recognition and extended influence involve greater responsibility and moral obligations—§ 14. Influence of Trade Unions on social and physical life of workers; average duration of life, examples quoted—§ 15. Prospective measures—§ 16. Employment of Trade Union funds—§ 17. The future of labour; Labour's Utopia . . 481

THE CONFLICTS

OF

CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

CHAPTER I.

PART I.—THE ORIGIN AND ESSENCE OF GUILDS.

§ 1. The origin of Guilds is very remote. The evidence as to their existence in this country, in early Anglo-Saxon times, is very clear and distinct, many of their purposes being accurately defined in ancient statutes. According to Dr. Brentano, England is the birthplace of guilds, although something akin to them, but in a ruder form, existed elsewhere at an earlier date. Northern historians ascribe the origin of these guilds to the feasts of the German tribes from Scandinavia. The term signifies a feast, banquet, guild, or corporation; in its primary meaning it implies a feast, and also the company assembled. Banquets and social feasts were the forms of celebration among the German tribes on the occasion of their sacrificial assemblies and anniversary festivals, and also on the occurrence of great political and national events, at which times those assembled deliberated on matters concerning the community, and concluded alliances both for the purposes of protection and of plunder. These feasts were also general in connection with family matters, such as births, marriages, and deaths, and in cases where an inheritance was left, there was something of a legal significance in the celebration of the event. We may recognise in these primitive assemblies the germ from which, in later times, and in certain stages of national growth, the guild developed itself, and became the natural successor of the family,

§ 2. The family is the natural foundation of all social relations; among the German tribes it was an important factor within the community even after they had settled into fixed abodes, and when the local relationship of neighbourhood had widened the sphere of social life and enlarged its circle. Its importance still continued to be recognised when the divisions into "hundreds" not only existed, but were even prevalent in municipal life. Kinship was but the natural extension of the family ties; blood-relationship being the first basis of all early communities, the social circle would be laterally extended so as to embrace those nearest related to each other.

§ 3. These kinsfolk were bound together in mutual responsibility one to the other; as regards the relations of private law—the legal protection of life, limb, and property—these were provided for by the family. According to the laws of Ina and Alfred, the paternal and maternal relatives of an offender were in the first degree responsible for his crime. These earlier forms of social life and mutual responsibility continued to exist long after the formation of communities, when society based on local relations had come into existence, and when the ties of mere kinship were lost or merged in the wider relationship of neighbourhood and locality.

§ 4. As society grew more complex and less stationary, it necessarily outgrew these simple ties of blood-relationship; in England this dissolution of the family bond, as the chief element in the community, took place at an early date, and at a time when the temper of the feudal lords rendered the dissolution perilous, and isolation on the part of the "freemen" dangerous. All social and political changes are of slow growth, sometimes they are almost imperceptible, especially in the dim records of early times, but in England the development of the earlier forms of social organisation may now be distinctly traced, if not in detail at least in outline.

§ 5. For a time the providing care of the family satisfied all existing wants; for society ties there was therefore no room. But when needs arose which the family could no longer satisfy or provide for, artificial alliances were sought, either to supplement the efforts of the State, or as a protection against

its encroachments. The necessities which called into existence these "artificial alliances" were varied; so also were the objects for which they were formed; but the basis of these early associations was in all cases the same, namely, the union of man with man for mutual advantage and protection. The growth of the towns gave rise to those earlier attempts at organisation, as a means of resistance to the influence and power of the great landed proprietors.

§ 6. The "town," in the first place, consisted of land owners, or "old freeholders"; those only had municipal rights, the "landless" men having no civic rights or recognised national existence. But there grew up within the town men who were not land owners; these had to fight for civil rights, and the sturdy old burghers bought their freedom in the towns, in many instances, by sheer bargaining, for the poverty, or greed, or both combined, of some of the feudal lords had enabled these burghers to purchase charters and grants of municipal liberties.

§ 7. The growth of the craftsmen within the towns gave rise to another form of social life apart from, and often opposed to, the old freeholders; these, in their turn, had to contest for municipal rights and liberties. The history of the rise of these craftsmen of the towns, their early associations, and the struggles by which they won power and privilege from the freeholders and old burghers, singly and combined, have hitherto found but an infinitesimal place in some of our so-called histories, but it forms an important part of our national history properly considered.

§ 8. The earliest distinct form of association which took the place of the family was that of the Frith-guilds. These were circumscribed and narrow at first, but they became broader as industrial and political interests developed themselves. As the family expanded into the brotherhood of kinship, so this in turn gave place to the brotherhood of the Frith-guild. These Frith-guilds in their earlier development, were partly social, partly religious, and partly protective. During the ninth and tenth centuries, the tendency to unite in a kind of guild had become general throughout Europe. The objects of the guild-brother were to seek protection among his fellow-freemen

by voluntary association with his neighbour for the purposes of order and self-defence, and to replace the older and more restricted brotherhood of kinship by a brotherhood based on the broader foundations of social relations.

§ 9. On the Continent these guilds were roughly met and repressed; scourging, nose-slitting, and banishment were the fate of those who united in these voluntary associations. In England they were more fortunate, for the system of "frank pledge," or the free engagement of neighbour for neighbour, was accepted as the basis of social order. Among the laws of Ina (A.D. 688–725) are two touching the liability of the brethren of a guild in the case of slaying a thief; and the laws of Alfred (A.D. 871–901) recognised the common responsibility of the members of the Frith-guild side by side with that of the kinsfolk; while the laws of Athelstan (A.D. 924–940) accepted Frith-guilds as a constituent element of borough life in the "dooms" or laws of London.

§ 10. The Frith-guild in the earlier English towns was similar to those which formed the basis of social order in the country at large. An oath of mutual fidelity among its members was substituted for the tie of blood, while the guild-feast, held once a month in the Common Hall, replaced the gathering of kinsfolk around the family hearth. Within this new family the Frith-guild was to establish a mutual responsibility as close as that of the old, and a protection even more complete and thorough. The one first principle of these guilds was: "If one misdo, let all bear it, let all share the same lot." If any member incurred guilt, or met with mishap, he could look for aid to his guild-brothers, either in atoning or paying. He could call upon them for assistance in case of violence or wrong; if falsely accused, they appeared in court as his compurgators; if poor, they supported him, and when dead they buried him. On the other hand, he was responsible to them, as they were to the State, for order and obedience to the laws. A wrong done against a brother was also a wrong against the general body of the guild, and was punished by fine, or, as a last resort, by expulsion, which left the offender a lawless man and an outcast. If, however, a member committed an act which

was wholly unjustifiable, he had to bear the consequences of the deed himself.

§ 11. In the earlier stages of their existence, these Frith-guilds were doubtless allied to the pagan form of worship, and celebrated their feasts in connection with sacrificial unions; as Christianity spread itself in the North, the milder forms of religious service gradually took the place of paganism, but for a long time prohibitions and menaces of punishment were needed in order to destroy the character of heathenism which still adhered to many of their ceremonies. The Christian religion was peculiarly adapted to the Frith-guild system; the elements of socialism and communism taught by the early Christian missionaries, and practised by them, and which afterwards led to the institution of monasticism, gave a mighty impulse to the spread of guilds all over Europe, and those in their turn assisted in the early propagation of the new faith, and aided materially in firmly establishing Christianity.

§ 12. The oldest, most reliable, and detailed accounts which we have of guilds, consist of three guild-statutes, the drawing up of which took place in the beginning of the eleventh century. In the case of one of these guilds, it was founded, and richly endowed by Orcy, a friend of Canute the Great, at Abbotsbury, in honour of God and St. Peter. Its object, according to the statutes, appears to have been the support and nursing of infirm guild-brothers, the burial of the dead, the performance of religious services, and the saying of prayers for their souls. The association met every year on the feast of St. Peter for united worship in honour of its patron saint. Besides this there was a common meal, and in order that the poor might also have their share in the joys of the festival, they received alms on the day of the feast, for which purpose the guild-brothers were obliged to furnish contributions of bread. Guests were only admitted to the common meal by the permission of the master and steward.

§ 13. The Exeter-guild, whose statutes have likewise been preserved, was generally of the same character. Here however, association for the purpose of worship and prayer stands out more prominently as the object of the brotherhood than in the former case. In this instance the guild-brothers assembled

together to worship and pray for the well-being of their living, and the repose of their dead fellow-members three times every year, each such service being followed by a meal in common. When any brother died, every member was obliged to perform special devotions for the departed soul. The mutual care of the brothers for each other was shown by money contributions in case of death, in support of those who went on a journey, and of those who suffered loss by fire.

§ 14. The statutes of the Cambridge-guild were somewhat different from the two above mentioned, for by the oath, which every member had to take on the relics of the patron saint of the guild, they swore faithful brotherhood towards each other, not only in religious matters, but in secular matters also; and although the statutes secured for the guild-brothers the same support in case of sickness and death as those of Abbotsbury and Exeter, and, like those, contained regulations with reference to alms, divine worship, and feasts, yet these objects were but secondary in comparison with the measures instituted for the protection of the members of the guild against criminals, and even against the evil consequences of their own wrong-doing. To effect these objects a complete organisation existed, and a system of regulations was framed for the purpose of carrying them out. If a guild-brother required help, an inferior officer of the guild, living nearest to him, had to hasten to his aid; if the officer failed in this, he was liable to punishment; as also in like manner was the head of the guild if he neglected to afford the required help. If a guild-brother was robbed, the whole guild had to assist him in obtaining compensation from the guilty party; so, likewise, every guild-brother had to help if a member himself had to make atonement for killing a man. If, however, he had no justifiable motive for committing the act, if he had not been provoked to it in a quarrel, or if he was not under an obligation to execute vengeance, but had slain the man from malice, he had himself to bear the consequences of the deed. If one guild-brother killed another, he had first to reconcile himself with the kinsman of the murdered man, and had, moreover, to pay eight pounds to the guild; failing which he was shut out from the society, and the members of the guild

were forbidden to hold friendly intercourse with him. In like manner, an insult offered by one guild-brother to another was severely punished. In cases of violence and damage to property which one member might have suffered from the servant of another, the master of the servant was answerable for him, and was sued by the society for compensation in case of non-payment. It was, moreover, a leading principle of the fraternity, to which every member had to bind himself by oath, always to support him who had right on his side.

§ 15. The essence of the manifold regulations in these three guild-statutes appears to have been the brotherly banding together, into close unions, of man and man, sometimes even established on and fortified by an oath, for the purpose of mutual help and support. This essential characteristic is found in all the guilds of every age, from those first known to us in detail, to their descendants of the present day, the modern trade unions. The objects, organisation, and rules of these fraternities varied according to the wants, interests, and requirements of the times and the circumstances of the case. The practice of periodical assemblies, by the guild-brothers for the common feast, was well-nigh universal, whatever other differences might exist, either as to organisation or aims.

§ 16. The numerous ordinances and charters of the early English guilds, disentombed by Mr. Toulmin Smith, and published by the Early Text Society, still further illustrate this phase of our history. These give, in clear outline, their principal features, and it will be found that they agree in all their leading characteristics, although modified to suit the time, the place, and other conditions. These records embrace the "Returns made into Chancery in the twelfth year of Richard II.'s reign as to the original objects, endowments, and extent of guilds generally," and include many others from sources not before known. The value and importance of these documents are as yet imperfectly known; they have been used freely throughout this chapter, wherever they assist in throwing a light on the matter discussed.

PART II.—RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL GUILDS.

§ 1. The German tribes having settled in fixed abodes, it became customary among the families dwelling in a particular district to unite themselves into common sacrificial assemblies; those taking part in them had to bring their food and drink, from which circumstance these unions were called guilds. With the introduction of Christianity, and its attendant religious fraternities, the earlier and the newer form of religious association became blended, until the latter ultimately absorbed the pagan sacrificial societies, and supplanted them, by substituting in their stead the more humane forms of Christian worship, for the heathen sacrifices which preceded it. From the unions thus formed arose the religious guilds of the Middle Ages.

§ 2. The earliest distinct information which is furnished with regard to these guilds is contained in the capitularies of Archbishop Hincmar, of Rheims, in the year 858, in which we find that there were two kinds of religious guilds, one among the laymen, the other among the clergy. In the capitulary relating to laymen the Bishop gives instructions to the clergy with regard to the solemnities to be observed at their meetings: in general terms, that only those things should be done which were compatible with their dignity, and required by reason of their utility and the circumstances of the case. More definitely, he says that "They shall unite for every exercise of religion, that is to say, they shall unite for offerings, for mutual assistance, for funeral services for the dead, for alms, and other deeds of piety." On the other hand, he forbids feastings, drinking-bouts, and other "heathenisms," and very precise directions are given with regard to the carrying out of these provisions, many of the prohibitions being mentioned in detail.

§ 3. In the Middle Ages these fraternities were very numerous in all countries, and especially in those under the sway of Roman Catholicism—even now, in certain forms, they exist in several of such Catholic countries; these brotherhoods, in fact, flourished, in large numbers, in almost every town—British and Continental. In Norwich there were 12, in King's Lynn 12,

in Bishop's Lynn 9; there were also 80 in Cologne, 70 in Lübeck, and 100 in Hamburg.

§ 4. A slight difference of opinion appears to exist as to whether these guilds should be called religious or social, or both. Mr. Toulmin Smith calls them social guilds, and in this Mr. F. J. Furnival agrees; Dr. Brentano, on the contrary, thinks that the proper term to be applied to them is religious guilds, inasmuch as their principal objects were essentially of a religious character, the social provisions being subsidiary thereto; whereas in the other kinds of guilds, political and industrial objects were the more prominent features, the religious exercises being common to all, as well as the social principles upon which they were based. Dr. Brentano contends that the term "religious" is historically correct, because, in the sense in which it was at that time used, it embraced the practice of those virtues which are denominated Christian, although many of the objects enumerated, which were then comprehended under the one term religious, used in its wider signification and application, would now be classified as social.

§ 5. In all places the objects and organisations of the guild were identical, and these remained essentially unchanged, during successive centuries, in all countries alike. The objects of such guilds were: (1) To unite in every exercise of religion, the performance of religious ceremonies, and in honour of saints. Everywhere they were under the patronage of certain saints, or of some other religious mystery. The use of candles was an early institution in these guilds; in some it appears to have been their only object; in one instance, at least, it seems to have originated an entire guild. In this case it arose out of a drinking-bout, where several merchants and shopmen having been drinking together, and having settled their score, six shillings remained over, with which they resolved to buy a candle to burn before the image of the Virgin Mary. From this simple and insignificant circumstance arose a guild, which rapidly increased in numbers and wealth, with a regular constitution, a guild-book, and aldermen at its head. But besides the setting up of candles, the members united for special devotions to their patron saints, in whose

honour masses were said, and they went in solemn procession to their churches on the days of the recognised feasts. Even in these early times conventions were not uncommon between the several religious guilds, as, for example, one was held between the saddlers of London and the canons of St. Martin-le-Grand, by which the former were admitted into equal brotherhood and partnership of masses, orisons, and other good deeds, with the canons. The members were obliged to engage in devotions and services for the souls of their departed brethren, and often, also, to aid pilgrims and pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and to other places.

§ 6. (2) Those guilds were instituted for the purposes of Christian charity, for the mutual assistance of each other in all cases of emergency—in old age, sickness, poverty (if not brought on by their own folly), of wrongful imprisonment, loss by fire, flood, or shipwreck, aid by loans, provision of work, and lastly, burial of the dead. They specially included the assistance of the poor and sick, and the visitation and comfort of prisoners, who were not members of the guild.

§ 7. (3) The advancement of education was not forgotten, for we find among the objects of those religious guilds provision for the aid of poor scholars, the maintenance of schools, and the payment of schoolmasters.

§ 8. (4) Sometimes a guild was founded for a special purpose, such as the Corpus Christi guild at York, where all the crafts joined in a procession for the celebration of the consecrated host, which is one of the greatest feasts of the Roman Catholic Church.

§ 9. (5) There were also guilds for the representation of religious plays, which practice was common in all countries during the Middle Ages. Of this class may be mentioned the Guild of the Lord's Prayer at York, the Guilds of St. Elene, of St. Mary, and of Corpus Christi at Beverley.

§ 10. (6) The performance of secular plays and the institution of pastimes were also the objects of some guilds, as, for instance, the guilds at Stamford, and at Rouen.

§ 11. (7) All objects of common interest for which in these later days special societies and associations are established,

such as benefit societies and insurance companies, were provided for by the guilds of the Middle Ages, the motive and principle of such unions being Christian charity, instead of, as now, profit. Similar institutions still exist, modified in form, in many Catholic countries.

§ 12. As a rule, people of all ranks participated in the religious guilds; sometimes, however, people out of a certain rank were not admitted, or special regulations were made in regard to their admission. This is well illustrated in the ordinances of the Guild of St. Michael, at Lincoln, founded on Easter Eve, A.D. 1350, in which it is stated that "whereas this guild was founded by folks of common and middling rank, it is ordained that no one of the rank of mayor or bailiff shall become a brother of the guild, unless he is found to be of humble, good, and honest conversation, and is admitted by the choice and common consent of the brethren and sisteren of the guild." It was further provided that "no one shall have any claim to office in this guild on account of the honour and dignity of his personal rank." In this instance women were members of the guild.

§ 13. In some cases there were special liveries for the guild; these were to be worn at their feasts, at which drinking-bouts were sometimes so general, that direct references are made to them in the guild-statutes, in which it is stated that "not eating and drinking, but mutual assistance and justice, were the principal objects of the guild."

§ 14. The expenses for securing and maintaining the objects of these guilds were obtained by means of entrance fees, contributions, gifts, and legacies of members. Sometimes the contributions were fixed, at other times they varied according to the wants and requirements of the fraternity.

§ 15. The organisation of the religious guilds was the same as that of all other guilds down to the time of the institution of their latest representatives, the modern trade unions; the officers were chosen at their meetings, and fines were inflicted for not accepting office when elected. Often the members had, on being admitted, to declare by oath that they would fulfil all their obligations.

§ 16. Persons of ill-repute were not to be admitted, and members guilty of misconduct were to be excluded. Rules were made and enforced with regard to proper behaviour, and even as to decent dress, at guild-meetings, some of which regulations are found to be in existence even to this day.

§ 17. Disputes among the members were to be decided by the guild, and disclosing the affairs of the fraternity was to be severely punished. Both of these regulations are still, to some extent, extant in the modern trade union.

§ 18. In those places where the guild had no special hall of its own, its meetings were often held in the Town Hall; which shows that these ancient fraternities enjoyed a high consideration, and were held in good repute in those days.

§ 19. As to the guilds among the clergy, the capitularies contain ordinances against the extravagances of priests at funeral meals, and at the usual periodical feastings. No priest was to get drunk; nor was he to empty goblets to the health of saints, or to the soul of the deceased; neither was he to force others to drink, nor get drunk at the desire of others. They were not to burst out into indecent noise, or roaring laughter, nor sing vain songs, or tell inane jokes; neither were they to allow scandalous performances of bears or female dancers to be made before them, nor delight in mummeries, "because this was heathenish and forbidden by the Canon law." And further, they were not on every occasion to provoke each other, or anybody else, to passion and quarrel, and still less to fighting and murder; nor was he who was provoked to assail at once his provoker. The priests were further charged to breakfast with honesty and the fear of God; holy stories and admonitions were to be read, and hymns sung, and every one was to go home in good time. Exactly the same ordinances are also contained in the capitularies of Bishop Walter of Orleans, dated in the same year (858). These documents give us a curious glimpse into the character of the priesthood of those early times; and it is somewhat singular, to say the least, that the special charges, as to the extravagances usual at these feasts, are addressed, not to the laity, but to the clergy.

§ 20. In later times the clergy assembled on the first day of

each month for divine service, for deliberation on their interests, and for common meals, from whence they formed themselves into special fraternities, which were called the "Guilds of the Kalenders," from their meetings being on the first of each month. The objects of these guilds were subsequently extended to the exercise of any good works, especially towards the guild-brothers themselves, the assistance of the poor, the furnishing of church attire, keeping old records, and the maintenance of schools. Those fraternities were originally confined to the clergy, but later on laymen were admitted to take part in them. The number of members in those guilds was often limited, sometimes to twelve, at other times to twenty-four; in which case the proportion between lay and clerical members was fixed. The laymen, however, held a subordinate position; they occupied separate seats at the meals, and they had no vote in the deliberations. In 1422, the wives of laymen were admitted to the meals, but only on condition that the one whose turn it was should provide the meal, and wait at table.

§ 21. There were also special guilds for various classes and ranks, called the Major and Minor Guilds of the Kalenders, one of which existed in most towns, and in the larger towns more than one. Their organisation was, in general, the same as in all other guilds; often the president was called Dean; they also had halls, to which the brothers used to resort "to beer and to wine."

§ 22. These religious guilds continued to exist in great numbers down to the time of the Reformation, when the whole fabric was shaken to its foundation, and in all countries where Protestantism gained the ascendency they were by law abolished, as religious communities. In England the treasures of these ancient guilds were confiscated in favour of the king and his courtiers; but on the Continent the property and income of these guilds were delivered over to the common treasury for the use of the poor, to poor-houses, hospitals, and schools, according to the intention of the original founders.

§ 23. With regard to the "confiscation" of the property of these guilds, the following extracts, from the excellent introduction to the "English Gilds," by Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith,

represent the opinions of a man, the late Mr. Toulmin Smith, who had devoted more time and attention to these matters than almost any other Englishman, and whose conclusions, therefore, are entitled to every consideration and respect.

§ 24. "Under the Act for the Dissolution of Colleges (37 Hen. VIII. c. 4) the possessions of certain fraternities, brotherhoods, and guilds that had been dissolved with the colleges and chantries, were vested in the Crown; and the king was empowered to send out commissioners to seize the possessions of others, under the plea that they should be 'used and exercised to more godly and virtuous purposes,' the commissioners being directed to return certificates 'in writing of their doings in the same into the Court of Chancery.' The Act of 1 Ed. VI. c. 14 went further than this; after completing the demolition of colleges, free chapels, and chantries, it proceeded not only separately by name to vest in the king all sums of money devoted 'by any manner of corporations, guilds, fraternities, companies or fellowships, or mysteries, or crafts,' to the support of a priest, obits, or lights (which might be taken under the colour of religion), but to hand over to the Crown 'all fraternities, brotherhoods, and guilds, being within the realm of England and Wales, and other the king's dominions; and all manors, lands, tenements, and other hereditaments belonging to them or any of them,' excepting certain of them which were named, being trading guilds, which proviso saved those in the city of London." "The Act of 37 Hen. VIII. c. 4, passed in 1545, put it that this wanton and wicked pillage of public property was necessary 'for the maintenance of these present wars;' but it also cleverly put into one group 'colleges, free-chapelles, chantries, hospitalles, fraternities, brotherhedds, and guyldes.' The Act of 1 Ed. VI. c. 14 was still more ingenious, for it held up the dogma of purgatory to abhorrence, and began to hint at grammar schools. The object of both Acts was the same. All the possessions of all guilds, except such as could creep out of their provisions on the score of being trading guilds, became vested by these two Acts in the Crown; and the unprincipled courtiers who had devised and helped the scheme, gorged themselves out of this wholesale plunder, of what was,

in every sense, public property. In another place Mr. Smith says it was 'a case of pure wholesale robbery and plunder, done by an unscrupulous faction, to satisfy their personal greed under cover of law.' No more gross case of wanton plunder is to be found in the history of all Europe, no page so black in English History."

§ 25. In Denmark these religious guilds continued after the Reformation; but the meetings were no longer held monthly, but once, or a few times yearly. In some of these gatherings the same abuses existed, and extravagances occurred, as those to which references were made by Hincmar in the ninth century. Modifications were from time to time made; but after the meals the priests "sometimes quarrelled scandalously, and made a great uproar." When the early zeal with regard to the Reformation had somewhat cooled down, the want of those old convivial and social gatherings began to be again felt, and guilds were to some extent re-established, but for social purposes only, for the essential nature of the earlier guilds was lost in the new conditions of religious life brought about by the Reformation. It is extremely probable that the earlier clubs and benefit societies originated out of the later phases of these religious guilds, for we find certain analogies between the religious and social guilds, and the first attempts to establish the friendly society. The village club, with its processions, its march to the parish church, its feast, the bell-ringing, and general conviviality, together with its rustic rules and its ruder forms of association, all combine to render the resemblance striking, and point to an early origin, although changed by circumstances and by time.

§ 26. The great analogy between the modern friendly societies and the old religious and social guilds has been often pointed out. Sir Frederick Eden, in his work on the "State of the Poor," says: "Notwithstanding the unjustifiable confiscation of the property of the guilds under Hen. VIII. and Ed. VI., there is every reason to suppose that private associations, on a more contracted scale than the ancient guilds, continued to exist in various parts of England, and that it is extremely probable that many of these societies (that is, guilds), even after

the confiscation of their lands at the dissolution, continued their stated meetings in the common room, or hall, for the purpose either of charity or of conviviality."

§ 27. Mr. J. M. Ludlow has instituted a comparison between these two forms of association, and has established the analogy subsisting between the later guilds and the earlier and cruder forms of benefit clubs, which were the forerunners of the friendly societies of the present century. It is well known that usage and custom will outlive law, and after the sanction of law is withdrawn, custom will frequently retain sufficient power to justify its being called unwritten law. Many traces of these old associations still exist, the origin of which is to a great extent unknown, or imperfectly recognised, in the new conditions under which they are now seen; some of these are preserved in the obscure customs of the poorer classes, and often only in those villages which until recently were remote from the great centres of industry and trade. The earlier village clubs long continued to practise some of those ancient customs, and thereby furnish evidence of their lineage and descent.

PART III.—THE MERCHANT-GUILDS AND TOWN-GUILDS.

§ 1. The sworn fraternities for the mutual protection of rights, and the preservation of liberty, in the shape of Frith-guilds, arose quite independently of the township, or indeed of locality. When the town grew into importance, there existed a similar necessity for the mutual protection of liberty, property, and trade against the violence of neighbouring nobles, ecclesiastical aggressions, or bands of plundering marauders, and the onslaughts of barbarian settlers. The feeling of insecurity within the town itself, at this early period, must have led the small freemen to the determination to form societies for mutual aid and protection, and in support of liberty, law, and order.

§ 2. The early inhabitants of towns were free landed proprietors, some having property in the neighbouring estates,

and residing in the town for security or convenience; others, and those chiefly, who held land within the territory of the township. The possession of town land was the distinguishing mark of these earlier burghers. This ownership of land alone carried with it the privileges of full citizenship, as it existed in the ruder forms of civic life. In addition, however, to the possession of land, many of these freemen carried on trade, and some also what, in later times, were called handicrafts. Common dangers, similarity of occupation, community of interests, and close vicinity of residence, were conducive to the conclusion of such alliances for mutual protection and aid.

§ 3. Hence we find the whole body of the full citizens, or freemen, uniting into guilds; the citizens and the guilds in time became identical, and guild-law became the law of the town. Such guilds, as before seen, existed in England in Anglo-Saxon times, and evidence abounds in proof of the recognition of their laws and ordinances, and of their confirmation by grants and charters, similar to those found in later times. The guild-charter granted to the townsmen of Beverley is not unlike the grants of civic liberties or constitutions to German towns, nor indeed altogether dissimilar to earlier civic incorporations in England; this charter decreed to the men of Beverley "all liberties, with the same laws that the men of York have in their city." This was confirmed by Thurston, Archbishop of York, and also King Henry I.; it is even stated that it was confirmed by the Pope.

§ 4. The same relationship between the guild and the town existed in France, especially in the eleventh and twelfth centuries under the name of the commune, the charters being ratified by the French kings. The numerous grants of communal rights to French towns from the eleventh to the thirteenth century are but the recognition of the Frith-guilds which had for a long time been in existence, exercising an influence, and exerting a power. In Flanders, the towns of the Netherlands, Sleswig, and Flensburg, the same recognition appears to have been extended to them; even if the kings did not like the power of the guilds themselves, they favoured their

existence within the demesnes of the nobility, as a check to the latter's ascendency.

§ 5. In Germany, during the tenth and eleventh centuries, the records as to the existence of the guilds are scarce in consequence of the measures taken against them by princes and bishops; but from those of later times we learn that here, too, the guild was the germ of the town constitution.

§ 6. Such was the power of the town-guild of Sleswig that, in 1130, when King Nicholas, whose son had slain Duke Canute, the alderman of the guild, entered the town, the gates were closed at the sound of the guild bell, the citizens thereupon mustered and seized upon the king and slew him and all those who tried to defend him. The king had been warned, but he despised the tanners and shoemakers, and heeded not their vengeance; they, however, had their revenge for the murder of their alderman.

§ 7. As the status and wealth of the people became more positive and diversified there arose questions of precedence; when the old guild was closed to new comers, other guilds were instituted. Then came the higher and the highest guild; restrictions were introduced as to membership, sons became the natural inheritors of the freedom and rights of the old guilds. The old guild, as originally established, was no longer equivalent to the whole town, or full body of the citizens, and in time the oldest, or "old burghers' guild," became the aristocratic guild, assumed the government of the town, and filled the municipal offices of the township.

§ 8. By the end of the twelfth century the patricians, or earlier aristocracy, began to exercise an oppressive sway; they had grown insolent, and looked upon power as a lucrative monopoly. This led, in the thirteenth century, to violent revolts on the part of the craftsmen, especially by the weavers of Cologne, who were at that time a thriving body. These craftsmen were no longer willing to bear alone the burdens of the Commonwealth; they desired to share in the administration of affairs, and particularly in what concerned the management of the city household, especially as the old burghers contributed the least in payment of taxes. Sometimes these

weavers of Cologne allied themselves with the bishops against the ruling families, just as the French communes united with their kings against the nobles, and as in recent times there have been alliances between the classes and the masses.

§ 9. Contests between the patricians and the craftsmen continued until the fourteenth century, when the weavers of Cologne ultimately won the victory. Frequent attempts were made by Charlemagne and others to annihilate those guilds, but they proved abortive, inasmuch as they were more or less adapted to the circumstances of the time.

§ 10. In England, even in Anglo-Saxon times, these guilds were far in advance of those in any other country; here the landed proprietors exercised great influence, and constituted the aristocracy. In Canterbury the condition of becoming an alderman was the possession of an inalienable estate, the possessors of which were united with other proprietors into the old guild of the Thanes, having precedence over the other two guilds then and there existing.

§ 11. The highest degree of development of these guilds was probably attained in London, which was perhaps their cradle, if not their actual birthplace. The constitution of the City was based upon the guild, and it served as the model for other English towns. Even in the time of Athelstan the Frith-guilds of London united to form one guild in order that they might the better carry out their designs, and prosecute more vigorously their objects. This united guild governed the whole town, its regulations being held to be binding even upon non-members. This union was probably caused by the rivalries of the older and the newer guilds, which had prejudiced the attainment of their general aims, namely, the protection of their freedom, and the maintenance of their rights. The knighten-guild was probably the original one, for the aldermen of this guild were the aldermen of the merchant-guild of the city, and it had jurisdiction both within and without the city boundaries.

§ 12. In the years 1283–4 the townsmen of Berwick agreed upon a set of statutes for a single united guild: "All separate guilds heretofore existing in the borough shall be brought to an end." All the possessions of all the previously existing guilds

were to be handed over to this one guild, and "all shall be as members having one head, one in council, one body strong and friendly." The way in which this statute was drawn shows clearly that the terms "citizen" and "guild-brother" were considered as identical. These statutes contained regulations with regard to the administration of the affairs of the town, its police, markets, and other matters of municipal interest. This appears to have been the period of transition from the older form of the Frith-guild, to the more general form of the local government of the towns. There is also evidence as to the confederation of guilds, not only on the Continent, but in Scotland, where the guilds of Edinburgh, Stirling, Berwick, and Roxburgh united into a general Scottish trade-guild. We have here a kind of prototype of the modern form of "amalgamation" by trade societies, into a national union, with branches in every part of the United Kingdom.

§ 13. On the Continent they seem to have taken more essentially a political form than in England, as indeed appears to continue even to this day, for in Germany they participated in the town councils, and even in the confederacies of the German towns or Flemish Hanse. These Continental confederacies of the thirteenth century originated under similar circumstances to the guilds then existing in England: they were instituted in the same spirit, were founded on the same principles, and were governed by similar rules as the Frith-guilds, with a corporate existence. They were strongest in the Rhenish towns, where for a time they stepped in to put a stop to club law, and enforced an entire system of law and order, with the authority of an empire. These guilds did not attempt to institute a code of laws, or they might have handed down a long succession of republics; they simply maintained the law as it existed, consolidating order and peace, until a stronger government took the place of the weak and insufficient one then and there existing. The statutes of these guilds were similar in their nature to those at Cambridge, the guild being but the enlarged family, whose object was to afford assistance, as one brother would to another, in all circumstances of life; a special clause in these ordinances ensured common and equal protection

to the wealthy and the poor, and to all sections, clerical, Christian, and Jew.

§ 14. The most complete in point of detail are the statutes of the Danish Frith-guilds, indicated in the following condensed outline. It is considered probable that these guilds were transplanted from England to Denmark under King Canute, about the middle of the eleventh century. These Danish guilds placed themselves under the special patronage of the three Royal Saints of the land, St. Canute the King, St. Canute the Duke, and St. Erich the King, and were called St. Canute's and St. Erich's guilds. The Government fostered and favoured them, as associations for the maintenance of law, order, and security of person and property. These guilds protected their members and avenged them; they atoned for their misdeeds, and prosecuted those who injured them. They rendered aid in distress, and performed services for the dead. The association was based upon the highest honour, purity of life and spotless reputation being the conditions of membership; each member was a pledge of honour for the other. So high was their character that in courts of law a less number of compurgators were required if they were guild-brothers.

§ 15. Although the merchant-guild consisted chiefly of merchants, craftsmen, as such, were not excluded, provided they possessed the full citizenship of the town, which consisted in the possession of estates situated within the territory of the town of a certain value. The separation into classes probably arose by degrees, for the craftsmen originally traded in the raw materials with which they worked; just as the London tailors, in the time of Ed. III., were the importers of the woollen cloth which they made up. With the increase of wealth and of population, there also came a greater division of labour; the richer carried on trade, the poorer became craftsmen. But a newer element was beginning to arise, destined to exert an influence for centuries yet to come.

§ 16. Admission to the town-guild was by means of a property qualification — the possession of land within the territory of the town of a certain value; this qualification had the effect of excluding the poorer freemen, a class which of

necessity grew in numbers, if not in wealth, from the guild, which henceforth was constituted of "traders and merchants" only. The new element which was appearing was by the transition from traders and merchants to a class of men who were only admitted to the guild after they had "forsworn their trade for a year and a day." As in article 25 of the statutes of the Berwick-guild, if a butcher was to carry on trade in wool and hides he must forswear his axe; corn merchants must not be bakers. Alas! we find the same spirit still.

§ 17. When the craftsmen were excluded from the guild, they were first governed by it, and then oppressed. The older guilds were favourable to the poor and to those of low station; but a certain amount of independence having been obtained, the old spirit departed, and the privileges won were monopolised by the few more wealthy members. Whilst the battle of freedom was to be fought, the "citizens" were benignant towards the poor so long as they were ready to help; but the possession of power rendered them forgetful of past services, and they, in their turn, became insolent and intolerant. The old brotherly combination being less needed, as a means of resisting baronial influence, the spirit of the Frith-guild degenerated and at last vanished.

§ 18. The accumulation of riches helped to widen this ever-increasing breach between the feelings and interests of the different classes; wealth acquired by trade was employed in the purchase of estates and lucrative privileges, which enabled the possessors to live in idleness, until at last it became the symbol of rank and honour, and those only were permitted to remain in the guild who carried on wholesale trade, and even this was becoming more and more restricted.

§ 19. These patricians, having now become the rulers, threw the chief burthen of the taxes upon the governed. The frequency with which these taxes were levied made them more and more oppressive; at the same time the income which the monopolies afforded, together with the corporation property and the revenues which it yielded, were employed for the private use of the ruling families, and in resisting the demands of the oppressed.

§ 20. As the law was at this time in an imperfect state, and badly administered, chiefly by those interested in perpetuating the evils complained of, redress was almost entirely denied to the unprivileged. The worst oppressions, in consequence of the protection given by a noble, or rich man, by those who rendered service, or who paid assessments for this protection, were condoned, until it was feared lest a new kind of serfdom should arise, more to be dreaded than the older form. Out of this arose a deep hatred on the part of the governed against the oppressors, and the one idea which seems to have animated the craftsmen, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, was the entire abolition of a patrician class. This can scarcely cause surprise, and the feeling which prompted this idea can easily be understood, when all the evils of those bygone times are fully realised.

§ 21. These aspirations were aided and promoted by the degeneracy and mischievous conduct of the patricians themselves ; in proportion as the principles of association among the trading classes grew strong, and were cemented with the brotherly love of the Frith-guild, and by the unity of interests which the poor inherit as well as the rich, so were they able to resist the wealthier burghers of the towns, and the contest thus initiated and fomented was fierce and prolonged. The more the interests of the wealthy differed from those of the poor, the closer were the confederacies of the weaker and poorer, and we find that, in the thirteenth century, the most violent struggles broke out between the craftsmen of the town, who were united in the most brotherly way into craft-guilds, and the patricians who formed the merchant-guilds, until towards the close of the fourteenth century, the victory remained almost everywhere on the side of the craftsmen.

§ 22. But during the contest severe penalties were often inflicted upon the craftsmen ; for instance, at Magdeburg, in the year 1301, ten aldermen of the craft-guilds were burnt alive in the market-place ; at Cologne, after the weavers had lost the "Weavers' Battle" against the ruling families, in 1371, thirty-three weavers were executed ; and on the day following houses, churches, and monasteries were searched, all who were found

being murdered; and lastly, 1,800 of those left were exiled with their wives and children, and their hall demolished. The exiled found a home at Aix-la-Chapelle, where they established and extended their trade.

§ 23. Fierce as these contests had been between the patricians and the people, the latter were moderate and even generous in their victory. The idea for which they had fought was equality of political and social rights, and for justice; nor did they forget their guild vow, or abuse their power when they had won the battle. Notwithstanding their hatred of their oppressors and the cruelties of the tyrants when in power, the townsmen did not seek to embody violence in their laws, or to wipe off old scores by retaliating upon those who had formerly been their enemies, or even to exclude them from their fair share in the government. Hence there arose mixed governments consisting of patricians and merchants, a majority of one vote being often left with the former. Thus education and rank found their place in the government of the towns, side by side with traders and workers. In some places, however, the craftsmen compelled the patricians to enter their fraternities, if they wished to take part in the government of the towns; but the great and powerful soon obtained such paramount influence, that new laws had to be made which provided that the "small folk" should form one half of the council of the craft-guild. In the long run, however, the craftsmen did not remain at the head of the town, but the principle for which they contended, and by their efforts had obtained, namely, political equality, was to some extent maintained.

§ 24. In England these contests and changes in the constitution of the towns took place about the same period of time. The ordinance of the citizens of London, in the time of Ed. II., that no person, whether inhabitant of the City or otherwise, should be admitted to the freedom of the City unless he were a member of one of the trades, or mysteries, shows clearly the then preponderance of the craftsmen. The completion of their triumph may be seen in the following account: "In 49 Ed. III. an enactment passed the whole assembled commonalty of the city by which the right of election of all city

dignitaries and officers, including members of Parliament, was transferred from the ward-representatives to the trading-companies." In the following year the number of the companies which took part in the election had increased from thirty-two to forty-eight.

§ 25. After the ordinance under Ed. II., all the citizens of London were obliged to belong to some trade-guild; and it is probable that the old burghers and members of the ruling families entered into some of the richer and more extensive guilds, from which, in later times, sprang the so-called twelve great companies, in which they pursued, in new forms, their old political and industrial interests. Towards the end of the reign of Ed. III. the separation of the richer companies from the poorer ones may be observed; they had then gained such paramount influence in the Common Council that from this time dates the still existing custom of choosing the Mayor of London exclusively from them. Here, as elsewhere, the power ultimately remained in the hands of the old burghers and richer families. Augmented, as they now were, by merchants and traders, even the term craftsmen appears to have lost its original significance; admission to the town-guild or merchant-guild was so restricted that the hand-worker was henceforward practically excluded. These, therefore, had to form new associations, in the shape of craft-guilds, and to fight over again the old battles, against even greater odds; for a combination had been effected between the two factions which hitherto had contended for the supreme or sole authority.

§ 26. Among the most powerful of those old merchant-guilds was the grocers, sixteen of whose members were aldermen of the City, and, in 1385, they carried the election of Sir Nicholas Brembre as mayor, for two successive years, against all the rest of the citizens.

§ 27. In the time of Hen. VI. the victory of the craftsmen was pretty general throughout England, for about this time the sovereigns began to recognise the constitution and liberties of the towns, in other ways than by confirming their guild, for "they granted to the men of the town or burgh a corporate and perpetual community."

§ 28. The trade-guilds, whose rise the old City authorities had tried to suppress, obtained the victory here as on the Continent, and at about the same time. The struggle was not so severe in England as on the Continent, for in the former case the ruling classes never obtained the same complete ascendency and power. In England, the rich never had attained the full mastery in the towns, their tendency being to live on their estates. Moreover, the ties between the sovereign and the towns were stronger here than on the Continent, and the caste feeling was never so great in Britain as with the nobility elsewhere; there was also greater freedom for the lower classes, and there had been the gradual formation of political institutions, fostered by associations of one kind and another, according to the relative social power and interests of the different classes. These circumstances combined tended greatly to ward off the bloody revolutions which exhibited themselves on the Continent of Europe. But as the race is not always with the swift, nor the battle with the strong, so in these contests the victory did not permanently remain with the victors. These earlier craftsmen failed in the one great quality of persistence. They fought, they won; but they did not maintain their vantage ground. It is the same to-day, they fight and win, but the triumph is usually with the conquered.

§ 29. In the Danish towns no exclusive right of special families to rule seems to have sprung from the guilds. The towns were smaller, and the guild did not appear as a close circle of families, combating for precedence; and as commerce was there of less importance, no very great difference arose between the merchants and craftsmen in point of fortune. These towns, however, were less independent than elsewhere on the Continent.

§ 30. These guilds continued to exist in Denmark until the Reformation, which shook the whole system of guilds everywhere, and caused most of them to cease on account of their connection with the Catholic Church. At a later period some were re-established, especially in Flensburg, Copenhagen, and some other places. But when the political and religious objects of these guilds disappeared, nothing remained but their social

gatherings, and gradually these became mere archer-guilds, the members amusing themselves at archery. In Germany, too, where they continued to exist, they sank into political insignificance, the only remaining advantage being the right of receiving some assistance from the funds, in certain emergencies of life.

PART IV.—CRAFT-GUILDS.

§ 1. The exact origin of craft-guilds, like other early institutions, is necessarily obscure; it is clear, however, that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries they had managed to wrest the government of the towns from the hands of the old burgher-guilds, or at least to obtain a share in the town government, side by side with those guilds. This shows that they already possessed considerable organisation, and wielded an immense power.

§ 2. The population of the chief towns, early in the eleventh century, consisted of (1) courtiers, ecclesiastics, and officials; (2) the old freemen, or burghers; and (3) villeins or bondsmen, who subsequently developed into handicraftsmen. There can be no doubt but that villenage was general in England, not only in the country districts or manors, but in the towns also, although in the latter it would differ materially from that in vogue in the former. Professor Stubbs says, "as originally all towns were in demesne of some lord, bishop, or king, all inhabitants would be less than free, until the town was freed by charter." The villeins were obliged to render common service to the lord, or bishop, either as *coloni* (villeins on country manors), or as *operarii* (handicraftsmen); but in either case their bondage was exceedingly mild.

§ 3. The handicraftsmen of the towns sprang chiefly from this latter class. These were of two kinds. First the bondsmen, who had to pay certain taxes, and perform certain feudal services and labours for their lords, and were subject to official supervision by officers appointed by them. But besides these there was a considerable number of free handicraftsmen who, probably, in earlier times belonged to the full body of citizens,

and possessed the full privileges of the citizen-guilds, but who, from various causes, may have lost these rights, and thereafter, either from necessity or choice, have become attached to those who formed essentially the handicraft class, and had thrown in their lot with them.

§ 4. The majority of the old freemen were able to preserve their privileges of rank over the bond handicraftsmen; their citizen-guilds gave them legal protection, and numerous benefits and advantages in all matters appertaining to trade; they enjoyed perfect freedom of trade in the towns; and they had the privilege of the free use of the market halls and other institutions, established for buying and selling their merchandise, or the produce of their labours.

§ 5. The bond handicraftsmen, on the other hand, and all who were not full citizens, and all foreigners, were entirely under the orders of the lords, bishops, burgraves, or citizens, in all trade matters, and as to legal protection they simply stood in the position of clients. They had to purchase from the lords of the towns the right to carry on trade, and to pay, by various burdens and imposts, for the privilege of using the market-place for the sale of their wares.

§ 6. The villeins, or handicraftsmen, were formed into unions or societies; these were ranged according to the kind of services which they had to render. Those who did not work as handicraftsmen served on the estates, under the superintendence and jurisdiction of a kind of local overlooker; while the handicraftsmen served under a more general officer who was entitled president. From these societies, or incipient unions, ultimately arose the craft-guilds. During the time that a portion of the craftsmen were in this state of organised bondage, and the other part remained free, there was little chance for the development of free organisation; as the whole class became freed from villenage, there developed those institutions subsequently called craft-guilds, which, as stated on reliable authority, "did not spring from subjection and dependence, but originated in the freedom of the handicraft class."

§ 7. The expulsion of the free handicraftsmen from the full-citizens'-guilds, placed those men in the same relative position

with regard to merchants and traders, as these had formerly occupied with respect to the barons and others, when the freemen first confederated into guilds for mutual resistance against aggression, and for the protection of individual rights. The citizens having established their own independence, and secured their own privileges, now sought to keep the handicraftsmen in a kind of subjection and dependence, and having the markets and trade matters generally in their hands they were able to take measures which injuriously affected the workmen. These efforts of the burgher citizens were not restricted to the bondsmen, but extended also to the free handicraftsmen who were made to pay imposts; and even foreigners were permitted to carry on trade, on payment of fees, to the injury of the interests of the native craftsmen. As in the earlier times the old freemen combined for the maintenance of their personal liberty, and the preservation of their freeholds and other property, so now the struggle of the craftsmen was for the purpose of protecting their independence and earnings, their stock-in-trade, and their labour. While they remained isolated they were weak, and, being at the mercy of their oppressors, they would have been compelled to succumb to the difficulties by which they were surrounded. Under these circumstances there arose a necessity for an organisation of the craftsmen similar to that of the freemen in earlier times.

§ 8. The constitution of the craft-guilds was analogous to that of the older guilds, which, indeed, served as their model; they were altered only in so far as the peculiar wants of the handicraftsmen rendered a change necessary for the protection of their industry, and the maintenance of their rights, under the newer conditions of trade.

§ 9. The weavers were the first to institute the craft-guild; they formed a kind of middle class between the patricians and the bond craftsmen; they were distinguished above all others by their wealth, self-respect, and love of freedom. Whilst the other crafts worked merely to supply local wants, the weavers found markets for their wares in the most distant countries. This naturally invested them with greater importance, and hence their unions enjoyed the fullest independence. In all

towns they stood at the head of the craftsmen, and in all the contests of the handicraft class with the patricians and merchants, for political freedom and power, the earlier struggles and the victories were those of the weavers. In all the chief manufacturing towns of that time, the most ancient were the weavers'-guilds, which existed in England, Flanders, Brabant, and the Rhenish Provinces. The guilds of the London weavers, and also that of the Oxford weavers, were chartered by Hen. I.; and in the reign of Hen. II. the weavers'-guilds, which existed at Nottingham, York, Huntingdon, Lincoln, and Winchester, were confirmed by charter by the king. Thus early in the twelfth century, the craft-guilds of the weavers were firmly established, under charter by the Crown.

§ 10. On the Continent they were scarcely less powerful. The wool-weavers'-guild, at Cologne, existed as early as the eleventh century, and the oldest German charter known is that of the Cologne weavers'-guild. In 1149 the pillow-case weavers formed a fraternity, with the consent of the judges, sheriffs, and aldermen, and thenceforth all who wished to carry on trade within the town were obliged to join and submit to its rules. The record proves that this union of handicraftsmen had existed prior to 1149, and that it was merely confirmed in that year. At Spire a guild of the wool-weavers existed at the beginning of the twelfth century; there is also mention of one at Mayence, in 1099, and of another at Worms, in 1114; while at Frankfort-on-Maine, the wool-weavers always ranked first among the crafts. In Flanders and Brabant, which occupied the first rank in the manufacture of woollen goods, the wool-weavers'-guild was still more influential and prominent, where it appears as almost the sole leader in all the movements and revolutions of the handicraft class. Even the serfs seem here to have confederated into guilds; so deeply did the old idea of guild brotherhoods permeate the inhabitants of these independent provinces, that it has been suggested that probably the first craft-guilds originated with the industrious and stubborn weavers of these provinces. This, however, is not the case.

§ 11. The first craft-guilds which were formed, were composed of free handicraftsmen, with the object of promoting their

interests, and improving their condition; but the influence of this new organisation soon had the effect of assisting to elevate the lower members of the handicraft class. When the bond handicraftsmen were liberated many of the companies, or societies into which they had been ranged, gradually passed over into free craft-guilds; hence they were to be found everywhere in greater numbers about the time when the last traces of feudal bondage disappear. When these obtained their privileges they were frequently compelled to pay certain fixed imposts in return for their greater independence in labour and trade, and for the remission of fines on inheriting property—to which their lords, episcopal and lay, were entitled—and for other concessions. These imposts were levied on a kind of *ad valorem* principle, in proportion to the privileges obtained so they were greater or less in amount. As these societies gradually changed into craft-guilds, they became impregnated with a different spirit, and were elevated into a new life, with higher objects and nobler aims. The origin of the craft-guilds, and the conversion of the societies of bondmen into free guilds, began with the dawn of the eleventh century, and extended to the middle of the thirteenth century, but the growth of certain of these guilds depended entirely on the development of the various native trades and handicrafts in the several towns. Some analogy has been traced between the transformation of the societies of bondmen into free craft-guilds, and the change, in later times, of friendly societies into trade unions; making due allowance for altered circumstances and conditions, there may be some slight resemblance, but it is certainly not very striking.

§ 12. The organisation of the free craftsmen into guilds was due to their want of protection against the abuse of power on the part of the lords and full citizens of the towns, who were trying to reduce them to dependence, and by imposts and otherwise to encroach on their earnings. By the institution of the craft-guild they were able to resist these attempts on their liberties, and the guild-brothers, by means of their organisation, maintained the customs of their craft, framed ordinances for its regulation, saw that these were properly executed, and punished all those who infringed them. To effect all this it was necessary

that every craftsman in the town should belong to the guild; but as in the first instance they were voluntary societies, the members could not enforce their regulations in a legitimate manner until the guild had been confirmed by the lord of the town, or by the general body of the citizens. The craft-guild as a voluntary society did not need confirmation by the authorities; but in course of time some craftsmen sprung up who refused to be governed by the guild, or who left it because they would not submit to the rules which were framed for ensuring good work and protecting the general interests of the trade; and as it was impossible to prevent this, or to check the evils which were likely to arise therefrom, then it became of the first importance that the confirmation of the guild should be obtained, especially when the members wanted it to be recognised as the special and independent association, which was thenceforth to regulate the trade of the town, instead of being regulated by the citizen authorities. When this power was once granted it was well known that all further protective measures would be sure to follow, in the interest of the guild-members.

§ 13. The great object of the craft-guild was to effect the transfer of all trade matters to the management and jurisdiction of the guild. This could only be done by obtaining a confirmation of their ordinance, which gave them power to prevent any one carrying on trade within the town or district, unless he belonged to, or joined, the guild. In return for this privilege the guild had to pay certain taxes yearly. In London these taxes went to the king; the London weavers under Hen. I. (1100–1133) and succeeding kings, paid to the Crown a rent for their guild, and other eighteen guilds are enumerated by Madox which were fined as a penalty under Hen. II. (1154–1189), as being unlawful for neglecting to pay this tax. The citizen burghers saw that if these privileges were conferred on the craft-guilds, the consequence would be that their own undivided sway could no longer be maintained in the towns; they were therefore extremely jealous of the new power which had sprung up in their midst, and threatened their own jurisdiction; hence they opposed with all their might the establishment of the craft-guilds as being detrimental to their own

interests. The whole of the early history of these guilds, from the date of their first formation, down to the time when they obtained the mastery in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, appears to have been nothing less than one continual struggle, the handicraftsmen against the citizens of the towns, for these coveted privileges.

§ 14. The Norman kings appear to have looked at these contests between the craftsmen and citizens only as a means of enriching their exchequer, for they seem to have confirmed or suppressed the guilds according as the one party or other was the higher bidder. This was their method of adjusting the claims, or reconciling the conflicting interests, of the two contending parties. The contest of the weavers with the citizens of London affords a striking example of the struggles between the rising craft-guilds and the old city burghers. The weavers had obtained from Hen. I. the privilege that "nobody, except by becoming a member of their guild, shall introduce himself within the city into their mystery, and nobody within Southwark or other places belonging to London, except he be a member of their guild." This was confirmed to them by Hen. II. This exemption from the authority and jurisdiction of the city excited the jealousy of the citizens to such a degree, that the weavers'-guild was involved in the most violent contests in order to maintain their privileges, and preserve their property. King John, in answer to the prayer of the citizens, promised "that the guild of weavers shall not from henceforth be in the city of London, neither shall (it) be at all maintained," but as the weavers'-guild had been accustomed to pay the king eighteen marks per annum, the citizens "should pay twenty marks in money for a gift" instead. In the sixth year of the reign of Hen. III. (1221–1222), the weavers'-guild and the citizens of London were again engaged in strife. Madox relates that "the weavers of London, fearing that the mayor and the citizens of London should extort from them their charter and liberties, granted to them by King Henry II., delivered their charter into the exchequer, to be kept in the treasury there, and to be delivered to them again when they should want it, and afterwards to be laid up in the treasury."

In 14 Ed. II. (1320–1321) we find the weavers still contending with the citizens for their privileges, but in this case it was in a court of justice. They had to answer a complaint of having transgressed and abused their privileges, and they had to prove their right to have a guild, as well as the legality of every single ordinance framed by them for the regulation of their trade. Their privileges, however, could not be impugned as a whole, but several regulations were pointed out which had crept in after the grant of their charter. These contests were not confined to London, for we find that the tailors'-guild at Exeter was engaged in a similar struggle with the authorities of the town. The charter of this guild was granted by 6 Ed. IV., but in consequence of a petition of the mayor and corporation of the town, it was repealed in the twenty-second year of the same reign; and yet we find the guild still going on, and prospering, and exercising all the powers contained in the charter, just as if the Act had not been passed. The reason seems to be that the quarrel was made up between the corporation and the guild, both bodies treating the Act of Parliament as a nullity. Certain it is that the guild and the corporation flourished side by side, and on the best of terms, as though no such quarrel ever existed. The charter was renewed and confirmed again and again, in succeeding reigns, and new ordinances and bye-laws were made, which were sanctioned by the judges in due form of law. The charter of Ed. IV., the account of the quarrel between the guild and the corporation, and the king's award, are given at length in Mr. Toulmin Smith's collection, "English Gilds," pp. 299–330. In some places it would seem as if these conflicts between the new organisation of the handicraftsmen and the authorities of the towns, were the chief cause of fixing the rights of the craft-guilds in a charter, as was the case with the bakers'-guild at Bâle. Whatever other results these contests may have had, they were not effective in suppressing the craft-guilds, either in England or on the Continent.

§ 15. It was absolutely indispensable, as a condition of complete independence, that the craft-guilds should have the right of freely electing the wardens, whose duty it was to regulate the

trade and manage the guild. In England this right does not seem to have been ever seriously questioned or restricted. Provision is generally made in the charters and ordinances for exercising this power, as in the case of the tailors'-guild at Exeter, where they are authorised to elect, or "choose a master and four wardens." In the case of the fraternity of the porters of London—constituted in 1646—however, it appears that the governor must be an alderman, and his appointment was vested in the court of aldermen; but generally, almost universally, the right of election remained with the guild. On the Continent, however, the right of appointing the warden of the craft-guild varied according to the nature or origin of the guild, or the degree of independence which the particular handicraft enjoyed at the time when its guild was recognised by law. In the craft-guilds formed by the free handicraftsmen among themselves, there was absolute independence, as for instance, in the weavers'-guild at Cologne, and in the craft-guilds in Flanders. At Bâle, on the contrary, where the craft-guilds sprang from the companies of bondmen, the bishop appointed the warden. The tailors, however, who were at the same time cloth merchants, elected their own warden in 1260. In 1157 Archbishop Wichmann, of Magdeburg, granted to the shoemakers the right of free election of their warden; but instances of similar concessions are rare. In Paris, in the thirteenth century, the provost appointed and deposed, as he pleased, the wardens of the rope-makers and the poulterers, but the bath-keepers elected freely and independently the wardens for regulating their trade. Subsequently the right of free election became the rule in all trades, until Charles IV. of France—1321–1328—deprived the Parisian craftsmen of this right of electing their own wardens. It is related of Charles VI. that, in the year 1408, whilst confirming the statutes of a craft-guild, he actually appointed one of his valets to the wardenship. In other countries, even as early as the thirteenth century, it became general for the craft-guilds to elect their own wardens; it was only in the German and Belgian towns, during the contests between the craftsmen and the ruling families, that the craft-guild had to acquiesce in the appointment of the warden by the patricians.

§ 16. After long, and in some cases very severe and obstinate struggles, the handicraftsmen of the towns triumphed over the old burghers; the right of electing their own masters and wardens was no longer a matter of dispute. This victory of the craft-guilds was effected mainly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in some towns sooner, in others later, according to circumstances, and to the degree of organisation in the merchants' or citizens' guilds, which varied in proportion to the completeness, or otherwise, of the severance of the two conflicting factions, into distinct and powerful classes, each contending for the mastery in the several townships. In London the craft-guilds appear to have obtained full possession of their liberties in the reign of Edward III., by whom the privileges which they had hitherto exercised only on sufferance, or on payment of firmes—a kind of rent due to the Crown—were now for the first time generally confirmed to them, by charter. The authorities of the city of London, who in former times had contended with all their might against the craft-guilds, now approved of their statutes. In the fourteenth century a large majority of the trade-guilds appeared before the mayor and aldermen to get their ordinances enrolled; and about the same time they adopted a particular livery for each craft; from which time forward they were called the livery companies of London. So popular had they now become that Edward III. was himself enrolled as a member of the linen-armourers, an example which since his time has found many imitators amongst his successors, and also among the nobility of the kingdom. In recent times these livery companies have, with one or two exceptions, been filled with men, good, bad, and indifferent, who know nothing of the particular crafts, and who have not the most remote connection with them; it is a distinction and an honour conferred upon political and public men, from the Heir Apparent to the Throne, to the Lord Mayor's coachman, the occasion of their enrolment being often an excuse for squandering the money of the guild in feasting by means of expensive banquets, and in the presentation of elaborate and costly caskets, containing the "freedom" of the guild to which such persons are admitted.

§ 17. Although by these contests the craft-guilds won political power, as well as their trade privileges, the full exercise of this power did not long continue in the hands of the craftsmen. Nevertheless, they retained for a long period, and everywhere, the independent government and jurisdiction over their trade, the fundamental principle of their trade policy being the right to live freely and independently by their own industry, representing both capital and labour, and the protection of their liberties and interests as a handicraft class. That this was so in England is shown by 37 Ed. III. c. 5, in the year 1363, which decreed "that all artificers and people of mysteries shall each choose his own mystery before the next Candlemas; and that having so chosen it, he shall henceforth use no other." The origin of this Act appears to have been as follows: In the 19th of Ed. III., 1345, twenty-two persons carrying on the business of pepperers separated themselves from their old guild and formed a society of their own. They agreed to meet together at a dinner, for which each had to pay twelve pence, and commit the particulars of their formation into a trading society to writing, and immediately after the feast to elect their warden and decide on their periodical contributions. These twenty-two pepperers were the richest men in that trade, and it is probable that they had formerly belonged to the old burgher class, but had been obliged, like most other trading citizens in the reign of Edward II., to join the trade-guild. These seceding pepperers having formed themselves into a separate society, and possessing the power to exercise the freedom of trade which had formerly belonged to them as full citizens, now threatened to crush, by their riches, the numerous other trade-guilds of the time. In a petition brought against them, in the 36th of Ed. III., it is alleged "that great mischiefs had newly arisen, as well to the King as to the great men and commons, from the merchants called grocers, who engrossed all manner of merchandize vendible, and who suddenly raised the prices of such merchandize within the realm; putting to sale by covin, and by ordinances made amongst themselves, in their own society, which they call 'the fraternity and guild of merchants,' such merchandizes as were most dear, and keeping in stores the

others until times of dearth and scarcity." This was the old principle of the "freedom of trade," so persistently and so long advocated by the rich, and it still maintains its ground, although in different ways and under altered circumstances, as the rings and corners of to-day testify.

§ 18. The same policy and principles which actuated the craft-guilds in England were equally prevalent on the Continent; the object was to enable each guild-brother to earn his daily bread, by his own trade, fully and independently; these are formulated with special clearness in the Emperor Sigismund's "Secular Reformation," dated 1434. After much complaining "that one person carries on more trades than belong to him," it is said in chapter v., "Will you hear, however, what is ordained by imperial law? Our forefathers have not been fools. The crafts have been devised for this purpose, that everybody by them should earn his daily bread, and nobody shall interfere with the craft of another. By this the world gets rid of its misery, and every one may find his livelihood. If there be one who is a wineman, he shall have to do with the wine trade, and shall not practice another thing besides. Is he a bread-baker, the same, etc., no craft excepted. And it is to be prevented on imperial command, and to be fined with forty marks of gold, where it is heard that the imperial towns do not attend to this, that nobody of any trade whatever shall interfere with the craft of another." We here find something of the origin of the prejudice, still existing in the present day, against one man performing the work of another, or interfering with a trade which does not belong to him; it is sometimes carried to extremes, but it is not altogether without its use—if governed by reason. This principle is embodied in the maxim: "Let the cobbler stick to his last."

§ 19. These objects embodied the wants and requirements of the craftsmen; the constitution of craft-guilds was the means by and through which they were to be accomplished. The fundamental principle upon which they were based was the same as that of the Frith-guilds—that is, the artificial unions which in earlier times had sprung up to replace the compact of the family circle, and to secure that protection which it had

formerly afforded to each member of the family. Like those Frith-guilds, the object of the early craft-guilds was to create relationships as if among brothers; and above all things to grant to their members that assistance which a member of a family might expect from that family. But as men's wants had become different, as the Frith-guilds were now recognised as a legitimate authority, which provided for the protection of life, limb, and property—the principal object of the craft-guilds was to secure to their members the independent, unimpaired, and regular earnings to which they were entitled by the exercise of their craft, as the means of obtaining their daily bread. When the craft-guilds were legally recognised as a constituent element in the organism of the State, and as special associations for the regulation of their trade, new duties devolved upon them in the sense of being made a kind of police authority for the purpose of carrying out their own regulations, and enforcing their own laws. There was thus added a new element, in addition to those which were common to all guilds, and they appear to have been general in all countries; in fact, their development was so similar, even in details, that by knowing the guild-statutes of one country we know those of all. The deviations were only in certain local regulations, they scarcely ever touched a fundamental principle.

§ 20. The life and soul of the craft-guild was its meetings, which brought all the guild-brothers together every week, month, or quarter. For the sake of greater solemnity, these were opened with certain ceremonies; the craft-box, containing the charters of the guild, the statutes, the money, and other valuable articles, having several locks, the keys of which were kept by different officers, was opened on such occasions with much solemnity, all present having to uncover their heads. Some remnant of this custom is still to be found in the modern trade unions; but it is preserved more distinctly in some of the "Secret Orders" of Friendly Societies. These meetings possessed all the rights which the guild-members had not seen fit to delegate to their officers. They elected their presidents, originally called aldermen, and afterwards masters and wardens, and other officials, except in those cases where the master was appointed

by the king, bishop, or the authorities of the town. As a rule, they were free to elect their own masters, either from the members, or from men of higher rank, though in some cases they were limited by their constitution to members of their own body. If the election fell on a member who refused to accept the office, he was subjected to a fine. Precisely similar in some instances are the rules of trade unions even to this day. There does not appear to have been, as a rule, any council or committee, although there is a notice in the records of the grocers, 1397, that six persons of that company were chosen to aid the wardens in the discharge of their duties. There is also in the same records, 1348, a notice of four auditors to superintend the accounts and delivery of the wardens. Other than these, no notice of the existence of a committee or of assistants, in England, appears earlier than the sixteenth century. In Germany, much earlier than in England, some evidence exists that in some of the guilds at Bâle and Vienna there was a council of six or eight men to assist in the government of the guild, and in discharging the duties of its jurisdiction.

§ 21. The wardens summoned, and presided at all meetings of the guild, and with the consent and authority of such meetings, enacted ordinances for the regulation of the trade; saw that these were properly executed, and watched over the maintenance of the customs of the craft. They had the right to examine all manufactures, and institute a search for all unlawful tools and products. They formed, with the assistance of a quorum of the guild-brothers, the highest authority in all questions affecting the concerns of the guild. No guild-brother could be arraigned about trade matters before any other judge; and numerous documentary proofs exist, showing both the severity and justice with which they exercised their judicial function. Whenever they held a court, certain special forms and solemnities were observed; for instance, in 1275, during the building of Strasburg Cathedral, the chief warden of the masons held a court, sitting under a canopy. Even after the craft-guilds had obtained considerable power, the local trades of the towns continued under a certain amount of control by the town authorities; in some towns, the elected wardens had to

appear before the mayor every year, and to swear "faithfully to execute their offices." The mayor also decided disputes between the several guilds, and he could fine and imprison the wardens of the companies at his pleasure. In other places the control of the sale of the most necessary provisions, such as bread, meat, drink, and fuel, was under the special care of the town authorities, in order to prevent adulteration, excessive prices, and overcharges.

§ 22. The punishment of refractory members was by fines, contributions of beer, wine, etc., for the guild-feasts;* for more serious offences, exclusion from the guild, which was equivalent to being deprived of the right to carry on the craft; princes, churches, and city authorities frequently came in for a share of these fines, and also of the ordinary entrance fees and contributions of the members. For enforcing the payment of these fees, contributions, dues, and fines, the old craft-guilds resorted to rattening, that is, taking away the tools of their debtors, precisely as they did formerly at Sheffield sometimes. But in those days rattening was legal, for the guild could sell the tools and pay themselves out of the proceeds. The legality of this mode of seizure and coercion was recognised even so late as the seventeenth century. Herbert says: "If anie member, of his froward disposition or otherwise, refuse to pay quarterage, penalties, arreages, or other amerciaments, the master and wardens, with their officers, shall have power at lawful times to enter such member's shop, and distrain the same." The seizure of tools and working implements was also effected, if the member did not pay the king's dues, wages due to another member, or offended against the guild. Rattening would therefore seem to have originated with the earlier trading associations, and not with the more recent combinations called trade unions. It was the old law of distraint by the creditor against a debtor; under the guild-system, every craftsman was compelled to belong to the guild, whereas now the trade union is a purely voluntary society.

§ 23. The object of the association of craftsmen was the

* The Fruiterers and Vintners preserve the custom of contributing yearly in kind, to the Lord Mayor, at the Mansion House.

regulation of their trade; they were specially recognised as the lawful authority for this purpose; it was therefore necessary, for the efficient carrying out of their rules, that every member in the trade should belong to it. There was at this time no question of monopoly, every person being permitted to engage in the trade if he submitted to the regulations, and became a member of the guild, when he acquired a vote, and exercised an influence on its decisions. Monopolies were the growth of later times; they arose out of the exclusive trading corporations, which first limited their members, and then prohibited non-members from carrying on their trade. When Ed. III. granted a special guild to the Flemish weavers, the London weavers were indignant, for they were opposed to the special privilege, and tried to compel the Flemish men to pay dues to their London guild.

§ 24. The income of the earlier craft-guilds consisted of entrance fees, wax for ecclesiastical purposes, and contributions which were levied as they were wanted to meet special cases, such as death, poverty, sickness, and the pilgrimage of members. Regular periodical contributions are only to be found at a later stage of their development.

§ 25. The rules of the guild had reference (1) partly to securing the good quality of the work; and (2) partly to the temporal and spiritual welfare of their members. In the first instance they exercised the function of a police authority for the protection of the public, and at the same time preserved the good repute of the trade, and prevented loss of custom; in the latter case they were bound in honour to aid their own members, and religious services seemed to form part of their ceremonies and observances. No person was admitted into any trade, even the lowest, or was tolerated in it, whose moral character and conduct were not good and honourable.

§ 26. Where the earlier craft-guilds were legally acknowledged, the right to exercise the craft or sell the wares depended upon the freedom of the city; this explains the political tendencies of these guilds. No person was admitted as a member who had not served a regular apprenticeship, and could prove himself a competent workman. The term of servitude

differed in various trades, but in England it generally lasted seven years; in France it was from three to four, or six; in Germany from two to four years. The occasion of the admission of apprentices was formal and solemn; it generally took place before the authorities at the town hall, or at a special meeting of the guild. The apprentice was instructed in his duties both as to his moral conduct and the trade; the indenture was the record of the act, and at the same time it contained the conditions under which he was bound to his master. Henceforward the apprentice was admitted into the family of his master, by whom he was instructed in his trade, and the master was held responsible for his morals, as well as his work, during the period of his apprenticeship. At the expiration of the term he was admitted as a member of the guild with special forms and ceremonies, and he became a citizen of the town. On both occasions fees had to be paid; in London they were 2*s.* 6*d.* when bound, and 3*s.* 4*d.* on admission as a member of the guild.

§ 27. These guilds not only tried to secure good workmen, but they also sought to procure proper tools and materials. No member of the guild was allowed to possess tools, "unless the same were testified to be good and honest," and regulations, the most minute, were made in the statutes with reference to methods of working. It was specially forbidden, in the strongest terms, to mix inferior things with a better sort, to the detriment of the buyer, or to sell patched up articles as new, so as to impose on the purchaser. What a flutter there would be in our day amongst manufacturers of all kinds, if similar restrictions were imposed; we should have no end of protestations, and declarations, against ruining the trade of the country, and losing the markets of the world. It is useless to speculate, however, for that time is not yet come. Measures were also taken to protect the public against the spoiling of materials entrusted to the workmen for manufacture. Provisions were furthermore made directing the guild-brothers to assist a member who did not know how to go on with his work, in order that it might not be spoiled. Such directions were frequent among the masons, special guarantees being often

given for the completion of the work. Subject to these and similar regulations, and some sanitary measures for ensuring cleanliness in carrying on the craft, all members of the guild were allowed to sell their wares within the precincts of the town, without any other control except that of the guild.

§ 28. The guild-statutes always ordained that no one "shall work longer than from the beginning of the day to curfew," nor "at night by candle-light." The ostensible reason for these prohibitions was to secure good workmanship, but it is easy to see that the real object was to secure leisure, and prevent the over-zealous competition of the few. Similar restrictions were made with regard to holidays and festivals; there was a strict prohibition of Sunday work from religious motives, and the Saturday half-holiday was general in all countries. This had its origin in Catholic countries from the custom of holding religious services on the eve of festivals and Sundays. English workmen lost their Saturday half-holiday at the Reformation, but recently they have managed, in the majority of trades, to regain it.

§ 29. Other measures were provided for the purpose of preventing a ruinous competition amongst guild-brothers, as being contrary to the spirit of the brotherhood, the ordinances being framed for the "better relief and comodytie of the poorer sorte." No guild-brother was to entice away another's customers or servants; and the statutes forbad a member from working for a customer who was still indebted to a brother.

§ 30. There are many peculiar regulations to be found in some of the guild-statutes, the number of servants are by some restricted, in others the prices of wares were regulated under the supervision of the town authorities; any brother becoming poor from "adventures on the sea, or the advanced price of merchandise, or by borrowing and pledging, or by any other misfortunes," might claim to be relieved in proportion to the guild funds. Even as late as 1723 the bye-laws of the guild of the carpenters and joiners of Worcester ordained "that wherever any freeman buys any parcel of timber or boards coming to the city to be sold and fit for the crafts, every freeman may have a share therein, not exceeding a third, at

cost price, on request, and paying ready money, under penalty of 20*s.* for refusing to share."

§ 31. So long as any members were out of work, no brother was permitted to work with a non-member. But they were always allowed to employ their wives, children, and servants, for the whole of the household belonged to the guilds; they were, however, not allowed to work with other women. At this time the manufactures were chiefly domestic, and hence by means of these regulations the guilds often degenerated into family coteries. If a guild-brother died, the widow could continue to carry on the trade and remain in the guild; if she married again to a man of the same trade she conferred on him the freedom of the guild, but if she married one of another trade she was excluded.

§ 32. Members were forbidden to offer insults to, or ill-use a brother, or to appear before a court of justice in case of disputes about debts or other matters, unless every part of the transaction had been first examined by the wardens, and compromise appeared impossible: their rules, moreover, contained provisions relating to their domestic conduct towards each other, and prohibiting unneighbourly tricks.

§ 33. These guilds stood in the same relationship to their members as the head of the family, each and all were equally provided for and assisted; but besides looking after the temporal welfare of the members, they were to some extent also religious fraternities: in this respect the craft-guilds of all countries were alike. They chose particular saints for their patrons, they founded masses, erected altars, and in churches and cathedrals put up painted windows where to-day their coats of arms range proudly by the side of kings and barons. In later times they went in solemn processions to their churches, and even now, in country villages, some of the local clubs do the same. They had their ordinances for the support of the sick and poor, and settled homes for some of the distressed. Every year special masses were said for the dead, the names of all the departed guild-brothers being mentioned in these services; and on the death of any brother special services were held for his soul, and alms were distributed to the

poor, who in return had to offer up prayer for the departed member.

§ 34. Sometimes we find several craft-guilds belonging to the same trade in one town; as, for instance, in London there were two farmers'-guilds, one without Newgate, the other without Cripplegate; similarly there were four weavers'-guilds at Cologne in the thirteenth century. The same thing exists in trade unions to-day. Similarly there was a tendency to unite or confederate, as the Cologne weavers did in 1396, and the fullers and shearmen in London in 1527. In some cases they formed large amalgamations like the engineers and carpenters do now over the entire country. In 1361 the tailors' union in Germany extended to twenty-five Silesian towns. Nearly a century later the cutlers'-guilds in Germany united into four great fraternities at Augsburg, Munich, Bâle, and Heidelberg; by these all disputes, which could not be settled by the separate guilds or by their presidents, were legally decided. But the most renowned of these confederations was that of the building lodges of Germany. This was effected in 1452; two years later the common statutes were discussed and passed at a general meeting at Ratisbon; these were subsequently revised and confirmed. Four central lodges were created, each with a separate district, Strasburg having the precedence, the other three being at Cologne, Vienna, and Zurich. The government of these confederations was almost identical with that of the amalgamated societies in our own day, not in general principle only, but also in the details of management.

§ 35. Regulations were made in the guild-statutes with regard to the relationship of masters and servants; masters were prohibited from engaging the servant of another before the expiration of his servitude, or so long as the former master had a claim on him; the number of servants allowed was defined; punishments were inflicted on masters who kept back their servants' wages; and it is probable that the wages were fixed by the wardens, by whom also all disputes were to be decided.

§ 36. There was, however, no real working-class or journeymen, in the sense in which they are now understood, for most of the craftsmen were small masters, with one or two appren-

tices, who, as soon as their apprenticeship expired, worked at their handicraft on their own account. The chief exception to this rule was in the Belgian towns, where the manufacture of cloth was carried on for an extended market, and on a larger scale. And here the servants, by their delegates, had a voice in making the ordinances for the regulation of the trade, and even in the supervision of the labour, and fixing the proportion of their pay. In some places the servants had an actual share in the masters' profits. Even where the woollen manufactures were entirely in the hands of the patricians, no regulations were framed without previous consultation with the servants. There was at this time no question at all about separate interests, and no ideas of distinct classes such as we see now—of capitalists and workmen.

§ 37. The contests of the craft-guilds were not consequently struggles for equality of labour and capital, but for the political mastery of the towns; it was a fight for the recognition of the political equality of stock-in-trade and real property; it was a contest of an oligarchy of landed proprietors and the new oligarchy of capitalists; as trade increased so the latter flourished; wider markets afforded greater opportunities for the employment of larger capital, and so the craft-guilds gradually changed from being societies for the protection of labour, into associations for the investment of capital.

§ 38. The spirit of acquisitiveness having set in, the craftsmen sought to increase the productiveness of their investments; they began to strive to create a monopoly, for which purpose they raised the entrance fees and established new restrictions as a barrier to the competition of the aspiring families outside the guild. On the Continent this spirit was carried to a much greater extent than in England; there every effort was made to debar all new candidates and refuse them admission; the endeavour being to restrict the guild as much as possible to a few families, sons, sons-in-law, and even daughters, each assisting to perpetuate the monopoly. Thus, in the fourteenth century, commenced the transformation of craft-guilds into a kind of entail for the benefit of a comparatively limited number of families; the grand idea of association for mutual help gave

place to a narrow-minded spirit, centralised in the mere acquisition of capital; petty rivalries and hateful egotism prevailed over brotherhood and equality of rights; the richer craftsmen withdrew from their poorer brethren into separate guilds, and internal disputes arose as to what privileges belonged to their special trade. It is asserted that the membership of the guilds was "grossly bought," and that, in the town councils, the crafts sought only their own advantage to the detriment of the public, and that, therefore, the only remedy was their complete abolition.

§ 39. The abuses which had crept into these guilds led, perhaps, to the ordinance requiring returns as to the aims, constitution, statutes, and means of the guilds, in the twelfth year of Richard II.'s reign. To this return we are indebted for most of the documents in Mr. Toulmin Smith's collection. Complaints of similar abuses led to an inquiry, in 14 Ed. II., into the case of the London weavers; and later, in 15 Hen. VI., 1437, the commons, in a petition to the king, declared that the craft-guilds had abused the privileges granted to them, by enacting ordinances hurtful to the common profit of the people. The Act of 15 Hen. VI. c. 6 was the result of this petition: it ordained that, besides the returns above-mentioned, the guilds should not make or use any ordinance disparity or diminution of the franchises of the king or others, or against the common profit of the people, or allow any other ordinances without their being first approved and enrolled before the justices of the peace, and that the same should be by them revoked and recalled, if not found to be wholly loyal and reasonable.

§ 40. The restrictions of the craft-guilds, and the aggregation of the craftsmen in the towns, prevented great numbers of the workmen from becoming masters, and, hence, there grew up a distinct class of operatives with views and interests separate from, and often opposed to the masters; the guild-statutes before the fourteenth century do not even mention the workmen; after about the middle of the fourteenth century it became necessary to make regulations concerning journeymen and their masters. The wardens of the guilds were still the

authorities to decide between the contending parties, and to enforce the payment of wages due to the journeymen, or to compel the obedience of the "serving-man" to his master. On the Continent, again, the restrictions were more severe than in England; in some places the workmen were compelled to work as journeymen for a certain number of years before they could set up as masters; in other places journeymen were strictly forbidden to work on their own account; the wives were not allowed to work; the men were frequently compelled to join the guild and to pay contributions, although they had no voice in its ordinances. A difference was also made in regard to those who had little prospect of becoming masters, and others who were apprenticed to a trade with that view. There were, however, some regulations favourable to the workmen, as, for instance, this: "If any serving-man of the said trade, who has behaved himself well and loyally towards his masters whom he has served, shall fall sick, or be unable to help or maintain himself, he shall be found (supported) by the good folks of the said trade until he shall have recovered and be able to help and maintain himself."

§ 41. By the plague of 1348 the first great lesson in political economy was given to all classes; if supply and demand are the natural and inevitable laws for the regulation of prices and of wages, these were well applied during this period. Merchants and traders took advantage of the scarcity of commodities and advanced the prices; in like manner the workmen demanded an increase of wages, because of the demand for their labour; even the clergy, taking advantage of their lessened numbers, charged higher fees for masses and prayers.

§ 42. This universal dearth of labour, as the result of depopulation caused by the plague, plunged even the propertied class into distress; in consequence of this state of things the statute of labourers was passed (23 Ed. III.) which ordained that "every man and woman able in body, and within the age of threescore, not living in merchandise, nor exercising any craft, not having of his own whereof to live, nor land about whose tillage he might employ himself, nor serving any other, should be bound to serve, if required, at the accustomed

wages." If he refused, "he was to be committed to jail till he found surety to enter into service; if he departed before the term agreed, he was to be imprisoned. None were to pay more than the old wages upon pain of forfeiting double what they had paid; if the workman took more, he was to be committed to jail, the overplus wages to go to the king's use." Two years later another statute was passed (25 Ed. III. s. 2) which interfered not only with labourers in husbandry, but also with those in several other branches of industry. "Carters, ploughmen, and other servants were to serve by the whole year or by other usual terms, and not by the day. No one was to go out of the town where he dwelt, in winter, to serve in summer, if he could get work therein. The wages of servants in husbandry and of certain artificers were fixed by the Act. Cordwainers and shoemakers were not to sell boots or shoes in any other manner than they were wont in the 20th year of the reign of Ed. III. Saddlers, horsesmiths, tailors, and others not mentioned in the Act were to be sworn before the justices to do and use their crafts and offices in the manner they were wont to do in the said 20th year and time before, and any one breaking this statute after such oath was to be punished by fine and imprisonment. If labourers or artificers left their work and went into another county, process was to be issued to the sheriff to arrest and bring them back."

By 12 Richard II. it was further enacted that "no servant or labourer, whether man or woman, should depart out of the hundred where he dwelt, to serve elsewhere, unless he brought a letter patent containing the cause of his going and the time of his return; and if he was to return, under the king's seal, which for this purpose was to be in the keeping of some man of the hundred. A servant wandering about without such testimonial was to be put into the stocks till he gave surety to return to his place." By the same statute it was also provided "that he or she who used to labour at the plough and cart, or other service in husbandry, till twelve years of age, should so abide and not be put to any other mystery." In the following year (13 Richard II. c. 8) it was ordained that "the justices were to settle and proclaim between Easter and Michaelmas what should

be the wages of day labourers." In order to prevent the rural population from apprenticing their children to trades in cities and boroughs, and thereby reducing the number of servants in husbandry below the proper level, it was enacted by 7 Hen. IV., "that no person was to put a son or daughter apprentice within a city or borough, except he had land or rent to the value of 20*s.* a year at the least, on pain of a year's imprisonment. And every person offering to apprentice a child in a city or borough was obliged to bring a bill sealed by two justices of the county, testifying the value of the said land or rent."

§ 43. This economical heresy of fixing prices and wages by law was not confined to legislative enactment, for we find that in 1350 the Mayor of London issued a regulation fixing the wages and prices in all trades in the city. The same thing is repeated in the ordinances of the craft-guilds, agreed to after the plague, the invariable rule being that nobody "shall take for working in the said trade more they were wont heretofore." In 1362, when a fearful tempest destroyed the roofs of a great number of houses, there was issued a royal order, that materials for roofing, and the wages of tilers, shall not be enhanced by reason of the damage done by the late tempest." It does not appear, therefore, that the *object* of the Statutes of Labourers was merely to grind down the wages of the poor, although at a later date they were frequently used for that purpose; the regulations then enacted were part of the policy of the time, as similar measures were provided against usury, and many other matters.

§ 44. The condition of things caused by the plague, and the circumstances arising therefrom, seem to have had the effect of producing quite a change in the relationship of labour and capital; the opposing interests of the workmen and their employers were now for the first time brought face to face on a large scale; the endeavours of the labourers to raise their wages were naturally shown in the strongest form in those trades which were the most developed, such as the cloth manufactures, in which there existed a large working-class element. In 1350 a petition was presented by the Master-Shearmen to the authorities of the city of London, "in which

they complain that they could no longer have journeymen at the same rate of wages as formerly; and that now the men will not work otherwise than by the cloth, and then so greatly hurry over the same, that they do great damage to the folks to whom such cloths belong." They therefore prayed that the old customs of fixing wages, etc., should be re-established, under penalties. It appears from one of their ordinances of the same year that strikes had been resorted to by the journeymen, as a means of procuring satisfaction for their fellow-workers; it was therefore "ordained that from henceforth, if there be any dispute moved between any master and his man in the said trade, such dispute shall be settled by the warden of the trade." If the workman did not submit to the warden, he was "to be punished by the mayor and aldermen at their discretion." A similar enactment is contained in the statutes of the alien weavers of 1362.

§ 45. The building trades acquired a standing of some importance at an early stage of our history; the beautiful cathedrals, churches, and old palaces attest the skill of the building operatives, and especially of the masons, at that date. The master of that day was the architect—not a contractor—the masters and foremen under him were held responsible for the work done, the workmen generally being answerable to them for their workmanship and conduct. In smaller buildings such as dwelling-houses, and the like, the owner was his own master; he found the capital, and generally conducted the work, having masters and foremen when required to see after the necessary details; hence we find that there were regulations as to the wages of the master, defining what amount he might retain of the wages of the journeymen, or that he should not deduct anything for himself, as the case might be. Sometimes the work was taken in the gross, that is, by contract, as is proven by the statutes of the London masons in 1356. The building trades were the nearest approximation to our modern forms of industry, the persons who carried on the trade on their own account being fewer, and the number of dependent workmen greater, than in any other trades; and therefore the relations between masters and workmen were somewhat

similar to what they are now. Strikes were frequent in those trades, even at that time; thus, in England, the "Royal mandate as to the workmen who have withdrawn from the Palace of Westminster," tells of a strike in those trades; the two laws then enacted against combinations, congregations, and chapters of workmen—34 Ed. III. c. 9 and 3 Hen. VI. c. 1—were directed against workmen in the building trades only; their peculiar position is apparent from the fact that all the legal regulations as to wages cited by Eden, refer, by the side of those employed in agriculture, exclusively to workmen engaged in the building trades.

§ 46. The combinations, which grew up in those trades, and which in that early age took the form of trade unions, were the result of exceptional circumstances; the growth of a distinct class of journeymen, with special interests and distinctive views, gave rise to the necessity, and called into existence these organisations. Hence we find journeymen in other trades forming similar associations in the city of London, and the authorities were afraid that the workmen would abuse their power and use the unions as a means of raising wages. Accordingly, in 1383, the city authorities issued a proclamation forbidding all congregations, covins, and conspiracies of workmen in general; in 1387 three journeymen cordwainers, wishing to found a fraternity, united with a friar preacher, in order that he might obtain for them a confirmation from the Pope, and thus secure them against the before-mentioned prohibition; but they were arrested and lodged in Newgate, under the powers of the proclamation, before their plan could be carried out. About the same time there existed a religious fraternity of the saddlers, they had their own livery and six governors: but the masters being of opinion that this association might be used as a means of raising wages, it was, at their request, suppressed by the city authorities. A similar fate befel the brotherhood of tailors in 1415, in which year the city authorities expressly reproached the wardens of the tailors'-guilds because societies existed among their workmen, although they were subject to the wardens' control. These likewise had their livery, held meetings and religious services, and lived together in common,

The associations, however, in spite of this attempted suppression, continued to exist, and in 1417 they petitioned the authorities to allow them to hold religious services, and "to do other things which theretofore they had been wont to do."

§ 47. While the city authorities were thus attempting to suppress the independent organisations of the workmen, they tried to soften the harsh effects of their action by always decreeing "that the serving-men in the trade aforesaid should in future be under the governance and rule of the masters of such trade, the same as the serving-men in other trades in the same city are wont, and of right bound to be." There was also added, for their protection, this injunction, "That the said masters must properly treat and govern their serving-men in the trade, in such manner as the serving-men in the city have been wont to be properly treated and governed." A means of appeal against the decisions of the guild-masters is likewise given to the workmen, for it is ordained: "That if any serving-man should in future wish to make complaint to the mayor and aldermen for the time being, as to any grievance unduly inflicted upon him by the masters aforesaid, such mayor and aldermen would give to him his due and speedy need of justice as to the same." It would appear that there was a tendency in certain trades to follow employments without having been first apprenticed, hence we find the following in the leather-sellers' ordinance, "That from henceforth, no one shall set any man, child, or woman, to work in the same trade, if such person be not first bound apprentice, and enrolled in the trade, their wives and children only excepted."

§ 48. The government of the craft-guilds and the regulations issued by the masters seem to have either given satisfaction, or to have stifled complaints: the latter would appear to have been the case in some places, for it is enacted by Richard II., "that no varlets called yeoman should wear liveries;" and in another, "that no livery should be given under colour of a guild or fraternity, or any other association, whether of gentry, or servants, or commonalty." In some instances, the masters and wardens of the guilds really protected the workmen against their employers: several curious examples of which are

furnished by Mr. Toulmin Smith, one being, where a master chastised his servant, and the master and wardens of the guild adjudged, by an award made thereon, under 21 Ed. IV., that the master shall pay the doctor's bill, the servant's board, heavy compensation, and a fine to the guild. In the ordinances of the guild of the cordwainers of Exeter, it is provided that a certain number of the wardens are to be regularly chosen from the journeymen, as well as from the shopkeepers or manufacturers.

§ 49. The degeneracy of the craft-guilds, the seeds of which had been sown at the time of their ascendency and authority in trade matters in the towns, was now accelerated, and they declined with ever-increasing rapidity, just as their predecessors had done. As the qualifications for membership became more and more a question of property and capital, so those who were actually members endeavoured to surround themselves with numerous restrictions, for the purpose of making the handicrafts monopolies for a few families. Their decay commenced in the fourteenth, and continued throughout the fifteenth century, until we find that Lord Bacon in his time described them as "fraternities in evil," so quickly had they fallen into a mean state and bad repute.

§ 50. Restrictions had been imposed on those guilds by 15 Hen. VI. c. 6, but they were, it appears, disregarded, the Act itself having expired. By 19 Hen. VII. c. 7 (1503) that statute was re-enacted; it prohibited "masters and wardens from making any new bye-laws or ordinances concerning the prices of wares and other things, for their own singular profit, until first examined and approved of by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, or King's justices." The corporations, again acting contrary to law, arbitrarily raised the entrance fee of apprentices to 40*s.*, but by the Act of 22 Hen. VIII. c. 40 (1530), the fees were again fixed at 2*s.* 6*d.* on becoming an apprentice, and at 3*s.* 4*d.* on obtaining the freedom of the guild. In 1536 it became necessary to pass another law (28 Hen. VIII. c. 5), forbidding the masters of corporations to take an oath from the apprentices that they would not carry on trade on their own account without the master's consent, and also forbidding them to exact sums of money on

granting the freedom of the guild. But even these express enactments were powerless against the selfish endeavours of the craft-guilds, to prevent apprentices from becoming masters, and thus diminish competition. In order to effect their purpose they exacted heavy premiums with apprentices, and thus restricted their number, as is shown by the following account taken from Stowe: "It was a great matter in former times to give £10 to bind a youth apprentice; but in King James I.'s time, they gave £20, £40, £60, and sometimes £100 with an apprentice. But now these prices are vastly enhanced to £500, or £600, or £800." Cromwell granted to the grocers a charter by which they were empowered to levy a fine of £30 on each member on his admission. Though the sums above-mentioned refer probably only to the twelve great Companies, the Acts of Hen. VIII. show the difficulties which were put in the way of apprentices becoming masters in all trades. This led to an insurrection of the apprentices on May Day, 1517, to another in 1586, against foreign tradespeople who sought refuge in England, and to a petition to Parliament in 1641, for prohibitive measures against the strangers, worded thus: "And first we beseech your honours to take into consideration the intolerable abuse of our apprenticeship; for where we by coercion are necessarily compelled to serve seven or eight years at least, before we can have the immensity and freedom of this city to trade in, those who are mere strangers do snatch this freedom from us, and pull the trades out of our hands; so that by these means, when our times are fully expired, we do then begin in a manner to suffer a second apprenticeship to them, who do thus domineer over us in our own trades," etc.

§ 51. On the Continent there were fraternities of journeymen similar to those in England. In their statutes reference is made to religious services at stated times, and to common meals; and directions are given as to the maintenance of order on these and other occasions, as to burials, the support and nursing of the sick, entrance fees, contributions, etc. Every journeyman was compelled to belong to the guild. The rules of these Continental guilds, as to conduct, etc., were precisely the same as those in England. These were recognised by the

masters' guilds, were established by their consent, and were supplementary to them. In Germany, ordinances against the abuses of these guilds are to be found in the laws of the empire, and were especially condemnatory of the exclusion of whole classes for such reasons as the alleged infamy of birth, and requiring the most extraordinary proofs of real nobility before a candidate was deemed worthy of being admitted into the guild. Enactments are also to be found against the exactions of heavy payments on admission, etc. As the term of apprenticeship in Continental guilds was not so long as in England, they compelled the journeyman to travel for some years before he could become a master. Then, at the end of the fifteenth century, they demanded a piece of work, as a masterpiece, as a prerequisite to the right of an independent exercise of the craft. This frequently amounted to a prohibition, for such an article was costly, unsaleable, and often useless. Expensive inauguration dinners were also required to be given before being allowed to become masters, so that a few only were able to bear the expense without incurring debt.

§ 52. The sons of masters were exempt from all such restrictions as the prolonged term of apprenticeship, the compulsory travelling, and the making of a masterpiece. The tyranny of these family-guild clubs went so far as to interfere with the most intimate domestic relations; journeymen were generally forbidden to marry, whereas masters were required to be married; sometimes the candidate for mastership had to point out the "honourable and virtuous" maiden, who was to be his future wife. The descent of the intended bride or the wife was subjected to the same scrutiny as that of the craftsman himself; if, however, he married a daughter, or widow, of a master, special favours were shown. These corporations often made a trade of their freedom. The privileges were difficult to obtain, but once obtained, they were hereditary, and therefore had a monetary value. In France they similarly degenerated and narrowed; the same favours were shown, the same restrictions were imposed, and the same payments were enacted, so that as early as 1614 the third estate desired the suppression of these guilds.

§ 53. As the craft-guilds degenerated into mere capitalist societies, so the government of them fell into the hands of the richest members; these were at that time divided into three classes: the livery to which the richer masters were admitted; the householders to which the rest of the masters belonged; and the journeymen who were simply called freemen, sometimes "yeomanry," or "bachelors." Instead of the former government by a meeting of all guild-associates, there now appeared a "court of assistants," who enacted the ordinances and governed the guild. The first legal appointment of a court of assistants in England was under Philip and Mary. From the time of James I., the transfer of the elective franchise from the "communists," to the courts of assistants, became general in the charters, and thus, what had hitherto existed merely on sufferance, became legal. The king appointed the first members of the court for life; as these died off, or resigned, the court filled up the vacancies from former masters and wardens, these being all chosen from the liverymen. To the rest of the guild-members, election day simply meant attending at guild-hall, on the day of election, to hear the names proclaimed. An oath was also introduced for all members, by which they swore to obey the masters and wardens, and their ordinances. Violation of the laws of the guilds, misconduct of members, refusal to accept office, etc., were punished as before, and the charitable regulations remained pretty much the same, except that they were relegated to a more subordinate position than formerly.

§ 54. This transfer of power from the meetings of the whole of the guild-associates, to the court of assistants, was not always effected without opposition, from a part at least of the members; these, relying on the old charters of the guild, claimed the right of electing the wardens, and of framing the ordinances for the whole body of the guild-members. But they failed to arrest this transfer of the supreme authority from the whole body to a party, and thus the government of the guilds fell into the hands of a clique. As time went on, the possession of large capital became more and more requisite, as the one condition by which alone the independent right to trade could be exercised. This impaired the prospects of the journeymen in becoming masters,

and gave rise to an ever-increasing antagonism between the interests of the workmen and those employing them. This state of things ultimately gave birth to a new organisation, with special laws, having for its object the protection of those who had been denuded of their former power.

§ 55. In Germany, the government of the guild did not fall into the hands of an oligarchy as it did in England, for the body of the guild-members continued to elect the masters and wardens. The system of travelling was, however, obligatory; and with it a system of relief became general. Lists of members wanting journeymen were to be found at the house of call in each town, the master whose name was first on the list, being entitled to the workman who first arrived in search of employment, if he needed his services. This system of travelling led to the formation of special fraternities by the journeymen, resembling in a striking manner the modern trade unions. The organisation and statutes of the shoemakers'-guild at Arnstadt is replete with interest, the ordinances containing the most minute details as to government, constitution, religious services, and conduct. The societies of the French "compagnons" correspond generally with those in Germany. In both cases the ceremonies on admission to the guild, and on other general occasions, were of the most exacting character, many of them positively absurd—a remnant of them have survived even to this day, in some of the Orders, as they are called, such as the Druids, Odd Fellows, and Freemasons.

§ 56. The practice, so often commented on in our own day, of having black lists was general, both in the late craft-guilds of the capitalists, and in the journeymen's fraternities; in these lists were entered the names of masters and workmen who were under the interdict of the fraternity, and strikes took place against those who had violated the rules or articles; in such cases they refused to work for a master, or with a journeyman, until atonement had been made to the guild. When a strike took place, the journeymen in other towns were communicated with, warning them not to come to places where there was a strike. In 1726 a strike took place at Augsburg; this subsequently led to an imperial decree, in 1731, directed against

these and other abuses of the handicrafts. But this decree and other imperial laws were disregarded, and the craftsmen hung together throughout Germany, until further tumults led to their suppression by law, although they were not stamped out of existence.

§ 57. These contentions and strikes arose usually with regard to an infringement of the privileges of the guild-members, innovations in trade customs, and the like; they were seldom about wages, although in France some such strikes took place. In Germany and in France, the working classes were completely organised, and to a certain degree they governed themselves under the superintendence of the masters. In those countries even the special fraternities of journeymen were rather supplemental to the craft-guilds, than confederations directed against the masters; the disputes that arose were not in opposition to the trade system which then prevailed, but disagreements as to the practices which from time to time cropped up; the interests of the two forces were not as yet in direct antagonism, certainly not such as when in subsequent periods antagonism gave rise to trade unions.

§ 58. In England an Act was passed in 1549 (2 and 3 Ed. VI. c. 15), forbidding conspiracies and covins of the sellers of victuals "to sell their victuals at unreasonable prices," and enacting, at the same time, with regard to "confederacies and promises of the artificers, handicraftsmen, and labourers, not only that they should not meddle with one another's work, and perform and finish what one has begun, but also constituting and appointing how much work they shall do in a day, and what hours and times they shall work," and further "that they should not make nor do their work but at a certain rate." These statutory regulations are, however, to be found in the bye-laws of the several companies then existing; and, consequently, did not originate with agreements of the workmen only, but were equally applicable to masters. The word "labourer" in the Act refers probably to agricultural labourers only; but "artificers and handicraftsmen" embrace masters and workmen, the provisions being directed against both; for, while the confederacies of the craftsmen in general are pro-

hibited, all conspiracies of "divers sellers of victuals" to raise the prices of food are also forbidden. The object seems to have been to check the abuses of the craft-guilds, especially in those trades which provided for man's daily wants, in which cases such abuses would be most severely felt. This Act therefore does not refer to associations of journeymen *per se*, but rather to transitory combinations for specific purposes; the existence of regular organisations of workmen, in the sense now understood, can scarcely be inferred from the statute. Precisely similar are the prohibitions in the German imperial code of police, 1577, where, of crafts in general, it is said: "We have also heard as certain that the craftsmen, in their craft-guilds, or otherwise, conspire and combine that no one shall sell his finished labour or work by open sale for more or less than the others, and they thus raise the prices in such sort, that those who need their labour, and wish to buy, must pay at their (the craftsmen's) pleasure, etc. We therefore declare our earnest opinion and desire that this shall henceforth be in no way suffered by the authorities, but that they shall watch over it: when the crafts offend, however, against this they shall be punished by the authorities, according to circumstances, without mercy." This avowedly applied to masters, as well as journeymen, in all the crafts.

§ 59. In London the apprentices of these days played a conspicuous part. Stowe gives an instance of their rising "when some of their *brotherhood* have been unjustly, as they pretended, cast into prison and punished." In the seventeenth century they often acted in a body, and took part in all the religious and political questions of the time, expressing their opinions pretty freely, and acting in concert. When Cromwell abolished the feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, "and other festivals commonly called holidays," as tending to superstition, and enforced a strict puritanical observance of the Sunday, the apprentices, who by this Act "were not only deprived of the benefit of visiting their friends and kindred, but also of all set times of pleasure and lawful recreations," petitioned Parliament for the appointment by law of one day in every month for these purposes; and Parliament thereupon

set apart for them the second Tuesday in every month. The masters were in no way pleased at this, and tried to curtail the play days of the apprentices, ordering that, upon these fixed play days, all shops should remain closed.

§ 60. The origin of the modern trade unions from the journeymen fraternities may be inferred from many peculiar circumstances, including the striking similarity of many of their more prominent features, in several important respects. The ceremonies in vogue in the earlier unions of the woollen manufactures, and which even continued down to within a few years ago, resembled those of the craft-guilds, both in England and in Germany, except that in England travelling was not compulsory, whilst in Germany and in France it was. To a great extent the unions originated from the practice of travelling in the two latter countries. An ordinance of the Clothworkers' Company says: "The masters, wardens, and assistants shall choose the warden of the yeomanry; they shall govern the yeomanry in such sort as in former times has been used." The union of the woolcombers, which, in 1794, presented a petition to Parliament, complaining of the use of the gig-mill, seems to have used its funds to assist those who were thrown out of work by this new invention. That club embraced every member in the craft; contributions were paid according to the wants of the society, journeymen travelling when out of work were assisted, the sick were relieved, and the dead were buried. Only those were relieved who had testimonials from the society as to their honesty and good conduct; those who had broken the rules or deceived the society lost all claim to relief from the funds.

§ 61. The general position of the workmen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and especially as to the relationship existing between masters and journeymen, may be inferred from the ordinances of the English clothworkers, then the most considerable of all the crafts, which ordained that all "controversies between the livery and their apprentices were to be settled in the old way before the master, at the Common Hall," and further, also that "journeymen should make no unlawful assemblies, brotherhoods, congregations, and flockings

together." Other guild-statutes of the same date ordain that "no person of the mystery should hire himself to a person of another mystery, where greater wages were offered; no journeyman should work with any of another fellowship if he can be set to work by a freeman of his own art;" no member was to suffer his apprentice or servant "to buy and sell to his own use, or that of persons of other mysteries, such practices having brought masters to an after deale and sore damage." These regulations were in favour of the masters; on the other hand there were some in favour of the journeymen, such as "No person was to exercise the trade who had not served an apprenticeship of seven years, or had been instructed by his father for that term." No member was to instruct anybody in the trade except his male children, and apprentices regularly bound; no member was to employ any workman except he were free of the company; no journeyman was to work with a non-member. Furthermore: "None shall lend out or put forth any of his apprentices to work with any other, because it will hinder and take away the living of free journeymen; no foreigner shall be employed before a free journeyman; no householder shall keep above two apprentices at one time, except he employ a journeyman freeman, and then he may keep three; every master, warden, and assistant may keep three." Again, 21 James I. (1624) enacts with regard to the cutlery trades in Sheffield, "No person to have more than one apprentice in his service at one time, nor to engage another before the former be in his last year, nor take any for a less time than seven years."

§ 62. The following, relating to the printing trade, is interesting, as bearing on the same question:

The Case and Proposals of the Free Journeymen Printers in and about London, humbly submitted to consideration, licensed October 23rd, 1666—Whereas there are at this present, in and about the city of London, to the number of 140 workmen printers, or thereabouts, who have served seven years to the art of printing, under lawful master printers, and are reduced to great necessity and temptations for want of lawful employment, occasioned partly by supernumerary apprentices and turnovers, which have increased the number almost to twice as many

on the whole as would be sufficient to discharge all the public and lawful work of the kingdom, the workmen printers abovementioned, etc., propose: 1. That no foreigners (that is to say) such an one as has not served seven years to the art of printing, under a lawful master printer, as an apprentice, may be entertained and employed by any master printer for the time to come. 2. That a provision may be made to hinder the increase of apprentices, and a limitation appointed as to the number, etc. 3. That no turn-overs be received by any master printer but from a master printer; and that no master printer turning over any apprentice to another master printer, may be permitted to take any other in his place, till the full time of the said apprentice so turned over be expired, for otherwise, the restraint and limitation of apprentices will be evaded, and the number supplied by turn-overs, etc.

It was for the purpose of maintaining these and similar regulations, especially as the masters refused any longer to be bound by them, that trade unions subsequently arose. Many abuses were also practised, which produced divers hardships among the journeymen, either because they were not corporate bodies, or because the Act, 5th of Elizabeth, did not apply to them.

§ 63. The decay of the old guiding spirit of the craft-guilds was now more than ever apparent: everywhere they sank into mere societies for the investment of capital or perpetuation of monopolies; they tried to increase profits by excluding competition, and hence they attempted rigorously to enforce restrictions which were oppressive to the workmen and injurious to the public. Guilds, which formerly comprised all kindred crafts, now split up into smaller bodies of lesser individual trades; these watched each other with jealous greed, to prevent encroachments on their special privileges, and they fought each other continually in endless lawsuits. The feelings of the journeymen were commonly enlisted in these bitter conflicts, in the interests of the masters, and then they were disregarded in the final issue of the contest. They shared in the degeneration of the guild, their position and prospects were in a sense bound up with the system, and they therefore looked rather to a reformation of the system, than its abolition. Some of the provisions were for their protection, while others were insti-

tuted to curtail their liberty; against the latter the workmen rebelled; but the masters held together and resisted all reform. The public desired the abolition of the system, but the State found it useful as a means of gaining the support of the middle classes, and subsequently as a means of exacting pecuniary assistance. Workmen were isolated in their methods of working, and consequently weak; they could not act with the same facility as the earlier craftsmen had done in the towns, for they had neither the consciousness of power, nor compactness of organisation, with which to use it.

§ 64. The first loan to kings by the guilds in England was made to Hen. VIII. in 1544; after this followed, under pretence of a zeal for the purity of religion, the most shameless confiscation of the whole property of the craft-guilds in favour of the king's private purse, first by 37 Hen. VIII. c. 4, and then by 1 Ed. VI. c. 14. The Corporation of the city of London had to pay £18,700 for the redemption of their own property and trust funds. From this time all such trading corporations were subjected to continual exactions in order to supply the Government with money; in manifold ways Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. contrived to screw out of the companies a portion of their wealth. This practice was continued through the Civil War, and the Commonwealth, during which time they had to suffer great exactions and oppressions. Kings and courtiers enriched themselves at the expense of the companies and of the public, by granting monopolies, and for the alleged purposes of oversight and control.

§ 65. The causes which led to the final overthrow of the craft-guilds arose out of the conduct of the trading classes themselves; the growth of large capital and its investment in manufactures, led to oppressions and abuses until the law stepped in as a relief. The statute 2 and 3 of Philip and Mary indicates the commencement; after stating that "the rich clothiers do oppress the weavers, some by setting up and keeping in their houses divers looms, and maintaining them by journeymen and other persons unskilful; some by engrossing looms into their own hands, and letting them out at such unreasonable rents as the poor artificers are not able to maintain

themselves by, whereby they are found to forsake their occupations, etc., it is enacted that no clothier living out of the city, burgh, or market town, shall keep more than two looms, nor more than two apprentices." This Act endeavoured to protect alike the workmen and the small masters, against the competition of rich capitalists. But neither Act of Parliament nor corporation law can long resist the logic of facts: the discoveries and inventions then being made, and applied to industry, had the effect of aggregating the manufactures into the hands of comparatively few capitalists; craft-guilds and corporations, with such forces arrayed against them, lost their self-importance, and, in their insane endeavour to arrest the progress of events, made themselves hated and despised. Contentions and excesses caused the removal of several trades to new centres, where they were free from the influence of intemperate corporate control. Manchester and Birmingham, and other places of industrial note, rose into importance, whose career of prosperity was soon to leave the ancient cities and corporate towns, with all their restrictive ordinances, far behind. The growing industries of these new centres threw into the shade the old boroughs, deprived them of their assumed importance, wrested from them their pretentious powers, and left to them but a mere shadow of their former grandeur. The craft-guilds declined, by reason of their breaking away from their ancient lines, and by the imposition of restrictive laws, with the object of creating and maintaining monopolies.

§ 66. In France, the people swept them away on the night of August 4, 1789. In Germany they were brought piecemeal to death, by several bureaucratic enactments, the last remnants being ultimately destroyed by the North German Industrial Code, 1869. In England they gradually died out under the new industrial system. All that remains of the ancient guilds in the livery companies of to-day is the feasting and drinking, the processions and regalia, which point to their mediæval origin; and their immense revenues, chiefly derived from monopolies granted in a bygone age, supplemented by gifts and legacies of former members and officers of the guilds, given with the object of benefiting the crafts to which they belonged, and which,

though they have had to submit to an investigation by a Royal Commission, up to the present day have managed to evade governmental control.

NOTE.—Since the above was first written some of the City Companies have devoted large sums to the cause of technical education, and to other useful purposes; but in the main the indictment stands good even in this year of our Lord 1890. The Royal Commission to inquire into "all the City Companies, the circumstances and dates of their foundation, the objects for which they were founded, how far these objects are now being carried into effect, and into any Acts of Parliament, Charters, Trust Deeds, Decrees of Court, or other documents founding, regulating, or affecting the said companies, or any of them," was appointed on July 29th, 1880. The results of the labours of the Commission are embodied in three volumes of reports, issued in 1884, as follows: Vol. I. (c.–4073) containing 366 pages; Vol. II. (c.–4073–I) containing 830 pages; Vol. III. (c.–4073–II) containing 870 pages, or a total of 2,070 pages of printed matter, much of which is extremely valuable. The Commission estimated in their Report, Vol. I., that the total annual income of the City Companies was from £750,000 to £850,000, the capital value of the property being computed to be fifteen millions sterling. The trust income was about £200,000 yearly; the corporate income from £500,000 to £600,000 yearly. Of the latter about £425,000 was thus accounted for: (1) For Maintenance, £175,000; (2) Entertainments, £100,000; (3) Benevolence, £150,000. Since the Inquiry large sums have been voted for the City and Guilds Technical Institute, the People's Palace, the Polytechnics now being established, and for other useful purposes.

CHAPTER II.

TRADE UNIONS, THEIR ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND DEVELOPMENT.

PART I.—THEIR ORIGIN—SUCCESSORS OF GUILDS.

§ 1. In England there grew up, as successors to the old guilds, trade unions of working journeymen. These, like the first guilds of the old freemen, sprang into existence as a defence against the great capitalists, who, being individually strong, were able to compete with each other, at the expense of the weak and of the public. This statement, as to the origin of trade unions, is far from being a new one, for both the friends and enemies of these associations have repeatedly pointed out their similarity to, and connection with, the old guilds; the former to justify, by this pedigree, their existence; the latter to condemn them at once, and *in toto*, by describing them as mere continuations of institutions long since antiquated, and no longer of utility. The enemies of trade societies generally dispense with all further inquiries into the real merits of their working by the dodge of applying to them the eminently useful epithet of "long condemned associations for the restriction of trade."*

§ 2. Every one who has made himself familiar with the organisation and rules of a trade society, and with the constitution of the old guilds, will at once perceive their resemblance

* This statement was true when written in 1877, as any reference to a file of newspapers will substantiate. Since that date trade unions have been courted and bepraised, mainly, perhaps, on account of their political importance and influence.

to the Craft-Guilds, of which indeed they are the real and legitimate descendants. When, from time to time, the poorer members of the guilds were gradually elbowed out by the wealthier, they soon began to feel the necessity for combination, and hence arose, in later times, the trade unions, which are as complete guilds in themselves, as were the town-guilds and craft-guilds of an earlier age. They are not, however, mere continuations of those now antiquated societies, but legitimate successors to them, based upon new conditions, social and industrial. This antiquity of descent does not justify their existence, unless other and more cogent reasons are given; but at least it should bespeak for them a more candid examination before they are too hastily condemned.

§ 3. Wherever we find, in any trade, the formation of trade unions, it will be found that they arose out of the same or similar circumstances, and were established for the same objects, as the Frith-guilds and the craft-guilds previously in existence. Under the breaking up of an old system, the men who were the sufferers from the disorganisation thereby caused, instituted a union in order that they might be able to maintain their independence and position. This fact, together with the identity of their constitution, at once justifies their being called successors of the old guilds, and also, to some extent, justifies the existence of these unions, because the effects resulting from disintegration, unless otherwise checked by strong restrictions, necessarily call forth, in all times, similar organisations to those destroyed. This might even be called "an historical law."

§ 4. Combinations and associations of workmen resembling trade societies, existed in England before 1562, but they were exceptions, chiefly in the building trades. The reason for this is obvious. Those trades, in the Middle Ages, approximated more nearly to our modern system of extended manufactures, with a limited number of masters, and large masses of workmen, often having sub-contractors, for portions of the work, and using their power to make deductions of wages from the workpeople, as in more recent times.

§ 5. As before shown, the statute 2 and 3 Ed. VI. c. 15 refers, as to abuses, not to associations of journeymen alone,

like those of our modern trade societies, but to the abuses of craftsmen in general, at that date. The regulations in the statute of apprentices, 5 Eliz. c. 4, codified the orders or ordinances existing for centuries among the craft-guilds, and applied them to all the trades of the time.

§ 6. According to this statute no one could lawfully exercise, either as master or journeyman, any art, mystery, or manual occupation, except he had been brought up therein, for seven years at least, as an apprentice.

§ 7. Every householder, dwelling in a city, town-corporate, or market town, might take apprentices for seven years at the least. But only those youths might be taken as apprentices whose parents possessed a certain fortune; and none could be bound but those under twenty-one years of age.

§ 8. Whoever had three apprentices must keep one journeyman; and for every other apprentice above three, one other journeyman.

§ 9. With regard to journeymen, in most trades it was enacted that no person should retain a servant under one whole year; and no servant was to depart, or be discharged, but upon a quarter's warning.

§ 10. The hours of labour were fixed by the Act to about twelve in summer, and from day-dawn until sunset in winter.

§ 11. Wages were to be assessed yearly by the justices of the peace, or by the town-magistrates, at every general sessions first to be holden after Easter. The same authorities were to settle all disputes between masters and apprentices, and to protect the latter.

§ 12. The Act of 1 James I. c. 6 expressly extends this power of the justices and town-magistrates of fixing wages, which was previously limited to particular crafts, to the wages of all labourers and workmen whatever.

§ 13. So long as the regulations in the statutes of apprentices were maintained, the position of the workmen was secure; while the long term of service assured them that which above everything they desired—regularity of employment.

§ 14. The magistrates were, according to the intention of the Act, to assess the wages so as to "yield unto the hired

person, both in the time of scarcity, and in the time of plenty, a convenient proportion of wages;" and the fixed hours of labour for that time were not excessive, especially as the manner of carrying on work was not then so exhaustive as it is nowadays.

§ 15. The restrictions as to apprentices prevented the skilled workmen from being lowered to the level of common labourers, through unlimited competition. But the operation of this statute was limited by interpretation to cities, towns-corporate, and market towns, and to those trades only which were established in England before the 5th of Elizabeth was enacted.

§ 16. Trade unions originated with the non-observance of these regulations, as will be seen by considering—(1) some of the trades subject to the statute; (2) some of those which were incorporated by charter; (3) some which were free from any restrictions, whether by charters or by Acts of parliament.

PART II.—TRADES SUBJECT TO THE STATUTE, 5 ELIZ. C. 4.

§ 17. The woollen manufactures were the old staple trade of England, and the craft-guilds of the woollen weavers were of great importance. The number of the workmen employed in this trade led them to combine whenever there was a temporary want of sufficient organisation. This trade was regulated, as to the use of machinery, by 5 and 6 Ed. VI. c. 22; and was further regulated as to the number of looms one weaver might have by 2 and 3 Mary, c. 11. Later on the trade came under 5 Eliz. c. 4. But the assessment by the justices of the wages in this trade seems to have fallen into disuse before the year 1720. In that year the justices again fixed the rate of wages, but it was not carried out in practice. The want of a fixed rate of wages led to oppressions of the workmen by the masters; which oppressions led the workmen temporarily to combine.

§ 18. In 1725 combinations of workmen employed in woollen manufactures were prohibited by 12 Geo. I. c. 34; and in the following year (1726) an Act was passed ordering the justices

once more to fix the rate of wages in this trade. Again the statutory rates of wages seem to have fallen into disuse, for in 1756, the workmen petitioned the justices, in accordance with this Act, to fix such rate of wages; but the masters presented a counter-petition, and the justices refused. The workmen were thus prohibited from combining, by an Act which was enforced, while the justices refused to carry out the Act for fixing the rate of their wages, thus inflicting a double wrong.

§ 19. The immediate consequences of this state of things were that the weavers revolted; they hindered the journeymen who went on working, and drove them from their looms. This strike led to riots, and resulted in a loss to the country, estimated at from £15,000 to £20,000. This strike induced the masters to agree with the workmen, and peace was again established. In the same year (1756) the justices were again ordered, by 29 Geo. III. c. 33, to settle the rates of wages yearly in the woollen manufactures; but the whole system was on the eve of a great change.

§ 20. These early conflicts were the results of individual attempts by the masters to abolish the existing order of things; but, as the legislature still maintained the old laws, these contests did not lead at once to the formation of permanent trade societies. The latter were brought into existence by the transition of the woollen manufactures from the domestic to the factory system, and by the attempt of the master manufacturers to get 5 Eliz. c. 4 repealed.

§ 21. In the last century the woollen manufactures were carried on by small masters, in their own homes. Even as late as in 1806, the number of such small masters, in Leeds and its environs, was estimated at 3,500. Every one of these had served a seven years' apprenticeship; even where the statute of apprentices was not known, either to masters or men, its regulations were maintained because they corresponded to custom.

§ 22. In the year 1806, in Armley, near Leeds, a small clothworkers' village of from 4,000 to 5,000 inhabitants, there were ninety-seven apprentices bound for seven years, and only

four for a shorter period. Each master employed on the average ten journeymen and apprentices, the rule being one apprentice to two or three journeymen; the master was regularly assisted by his wife and children, the latter, when working with their father, were not compelled to be bound by indenture.

§ 23. As a rule, those employed worked in their master's house, where the wool was passed through all its various stages until it became dressed cloth, and even, if necessary, dyed. Sometimes, however, the journeymen did the work in their own homes, and were assisted in their labours by their wives.

§ 24. The master himself taught the apprentice his trade. If the learner had a prospect of ever becoming a master himself, he was also taught how to buy the raw materials, in which case the master received a premium on taking the apprentice. After a seven years' apprenticeship the apprentice could at once settle down and become a master; but as a rule he first worked a year or two as a journeyman. Under this system a young man of good repute could generally get credit for as much wool as would enable him to start as a small master; but perhaps its chief advantage consisted in the promise of permanent and regular employment which it afforded, for slackness of trade did not at once stop work in the workshops, as the master went on working, although he could not always find an immediate sale for his products when he took them to the market.

§ 25. If a sudden stagnation occurred in the home or foreign markets, or by a large firm becoming bankrupt, the losses were distributed over a larger area than at present, for they fell on the whole body of the manufacturers; and though each small master individually suffered by it, there were but few, if any, whom it ruined. If such an extreme case happened, the smaller master often took work from another, so as to maintain his family.

§ 26. Like the trade of the masters, the employment of the journeymen was exceedingly regular; as a rule they were hired by the year; they had board and lodging at their master's, and received besides from £8 to £10 a year. Journeymen often

worked for the same masters continuously for more than twenty years. If trade became slack, or there was no immediate sale for the goods, the journeymen were not suddenly discharged in masses; such dismissals scarcely ever happened, for the masters and the men worked on in the hope of better times. The masters considered it to be a part of their duty to keep, in times of distress, those workmen to whose exertions in good times they owed their wealth. If a master was in want of work for his journeyman, he used to seek about for a job for him at another master's; if a job could not be found, he was kept on by his old master. To quote the words of a master of that time, "the men and masters were so joined together in sentiment and love to each other, that they did not wish to be separated if they could help it." If, on the other hand, a master had more orders than he could execute, he asked another master to lend him a journeyman; but working "to order," in the modern sense of the term, was seldom adopted.

§ 27. The centres of this organisation of trade were the cloth-halls to which the masters brought their products for sale. In Leeds there were two such halls, one for white cloth, and one for coloured; similar halls existed at Bradford, Halifax, and Huddersfield. The cloth was here examined and measured by the authorities. These cloth-halls were under the direction of trustees, elected for the year, by all the clothworkers of the neighbouring villages, as being the most trustworthy and intelligent of their body. It was their duty to watch over the general trade interests of the manufacturers, and to enforce the observance of all rules and bye-laws, which were framed from time to time for the government of these halls. Here, again, the rule as to apprenticeship was universally observed and enforced, for no clothworker was allowed to bring his wares into these halls for sale, unless he had served a seven years' apprenticeship.

§ 28. The introduction of machinery wrought a complete change in this state of things. The various processes which before had been chiefly performed by hand, under the master's own roof, began now to be executed in public mills by machinery. Mills were erected on rivers and streams with a view to fully

utilise the force from the fall of water, as steam had not as yet been brought into use as a motive power. In the neighbourhood of every manufacturing village several such mills were erected. The manufacturer conveyed his materials to these mills with little trouble or loss of time, and fetched the wares back after they had gone through the necessary process. The cost was but small, so that he was enabled to obtain by these watermills nearly all the advantages of otherwise expensive machinery. The master himself sometimes performed the necessary work, by the use of the machinery in the mills, so that it should be well done.

§ 29. This was still but an extension of the system of domestic industry, for the work was chiefly performed by the proprietors. But there arose in the west of England a class of "rich master clothiers," who bought the wool direct from the importer, and the native fleece direct from the woolstapler. These merchant clothiers gave the materials to the workmen to be made up, partly at their own homes, and partly at their masters' houses.

§ 30. There also grew up at this time the system of a division of labour; for every single process through which the wool had to be passed until its completion, the masters gave the ware to a single class of workers, none of whom went out of his own line. By this system the workers acquired greater skill in the performance of their special tasks.

§ 31. With the origin of machinery and the consequent division of labour, there came into existence a class of master manufacturers and merchants, who, possessed of large capital, erected mills and became wholesale manufacturers, the workers being no longer the owners of the material they worked upon. In one or more buildings, as the case happened, the operatives by the use of machinery worked up the materials belonging to the manufacturers, under the supervision of overseers appointed by the employers. This commenced what is now known as the factory system.

§ 32. The altered manner of carrying on industrial operations naturally led to changes in the position of the journeymen. The first was in regard to apprentices, who were no longer

bound by indenture, though they still mostly served seven years without it. In the mills, however, it soon became usual to employ workers who had served no apprenticeship whatever.

§ 33. There also grew up a system of employing women and children, the latter at an age which was not possible under the statute of apprentices, and at an earlier age than would have been possible without the use of machinery. The labour of these women and children was of course considered much cheaper than that of skilled workmen, and they consequently became competitors in the labour market.

§ 34. The number of employers who had served no apprenticeship increased more and more. Formerly the cloth of a master who had not served a seven years' apprenticeship, was not admitted to the cloth-halls; in 1796 the trustees framed a new regulation, according to which manufacturers who had carried on the trade of clothworker for a period of five years were to be admitted. Soon after all persons were admitted to the cloth-halls, without any qualification whatever as to apprenticeship.

§ 35. At first neither masters nor journeymen resisted this violation of the old customs and laws; probably this was due to the large extension of trade, consequent upon the introduction of machinery. But the employment of great numbers of women, children, and apprentices, and of journeymen who had served no apprenticeship, soon began to evoke discontent, as the innovation took the bread out of the mouths of the weavers. This led, in 1796, to the formation of a trade society, known as the "Institution," among the clothworkers of Halifax; its object being to prevent people from carrying on trade in violation of custom and law. They did not seem to know that, according to 5 Eliz. c. 4, they might proceed in court against the transgressors of this law, for they appear to have been entirely ignorant of its existence; they knew of the old restrictions as being the rules of the trade, and as customary, and therefore they sought to maintain them. Another object of this "Institution," or early trade society, was the assistance of sick members.

§ 36. When, by 39 Geo. III. c. 81, in 1799, all such asso-

ciations were suppressed, and the accumulation of funds was prohibited, this Institution was nevertheless carried on; but instead of keeping accumulated funds the necessary amount required was levied by contribution, in each case as wanted. In this society the workmen of several places, belonging to the same industry, were admitted as members.

§ 37. As the new system of employment spread, the workmen experienced a much greater irregularity of occupation. Fluctuation in trade affected the capital of a single large manufacturer more than it had previously done that of a number of small ones, by whom often it was scarcely noticed. Any general cessation in the sale of goods now led at once to the discharge of a number of work-people; whereas formerly, in bad times, the small masters had worked on stock, the new manufacturers avoided accumulations of stock, and worked only to order. Previously wages had been settled for a year, now every fluctuation in price led to a reduction in wages; besides which "the opulent clothiers made it a rule to have one-third more men than they could employ, and, then, these had to stand still part of their time." Under these circumstances many of the workmen preferred to work on under the old system, even at less wages, on account of the greater regularity of employment. To counteract this the master manufacturers, on the erection of a new mill, enticed by the offer of higher wages men from the service of domestic manufacturers; but as each fluctuation in trade brought reductions in wages, and the discharge of superfluous workmen, so these, when they found work again at a domestic clothier's, even at less wages, never wished to exchange it for the higher pay at the factories, because of the continual irregularity in the mode of hiring, and the probability of reduction in wages.

§ 38. With the growth of the factory system the home manufactures decreased, and the position of the domestic master clothiers became greatly deteriorated. Many who had been small masters sank to the condition of workmen; others, who might formerly have become masters, now ceased to aspire to that position and remained journeymen. Hence the small masters began to fear that the factory system would entirely

supplant domestic manufacturing, and therefore they supported the workmen in their resistance to this new order of things.

§ 39. As by 39 and 40 Geo. III. c. 106 (1800), all trade combinations were severely prohibited, the workmen thereafter combined under the cloak of friendly societies. The report of the committee on the woollen clothiers' petitions, March 14, 1803, contains the rules of a trade society, which had begun as a friendly society, on September 24, 1802; and also a copy of an advertisement from a newspaper, "calling a meeting of one weaver out of the parish he represents, in order to determine on prosecuting those who unlawfully exercise or follow the trade of a weaver." At the same time we find the newly formed trade society quite as anxious for the morals of the workmen, as the old guilds were, for they offered a reward to him who detected any workmen embezzling the materials entrusted to him to make up.

§ 40. The chief object of this, and similar trade societies at that time, was the legal prosecution of the transgressors of 5 Eliz. c. 4, of 5 and 6 Ed. VI. c. 22, and of 2 and 3 Philip and Mary c. 11. Several employers having been convicted, the master manufacturers of the West, and afterwards those of the North, petitioned parliament for the repeal of the above-named statutes. They especially urged the fact that there were no master manufacturers, and very few journeymen, who now served a seven years' apprenticeship, and that masses of workmen would become breadless if 5 Eliz. c. 4 was carried out. Some only desired the repeal of 5 and 6 Ed. VI. c. 22, but wished for the maintenance of the other two statutes for the purpose of protecting domestic trade, sections 27, 28, and 32 of the Statutes of Apprentices being excepted, as these interfered with the masters' projects.

§ 41. After the presentation of these petitions to parliament, the trustees of the cloth-halls at Leeds assembled the cloth-workers of the villages whom they represented, to agree on counter-measures. Petitions were prepared and signed in opposition to those of the manufacturers, and agents were appointed to support them before parliament. The trustees, acting for both the small masters and the men, prosecuted those

employers who violated the laws in question, the funds necessary for this purpose being raised by subscription.

§ 42. Notwithstanding these counter-measures, the said laws were, in 1803, suspended for the woollen manufacturers for one year, and all prosecutions for violating them were stopped. This suspension was renewed in 1804, 1805, 1806, and so on until the partial repeal of these laws in 1809, by 49 Geo. III. c. 109, and ultimately their final repeal in the year following, by 50 Geo. III. c. 83, in 1810.

§ 43. It soon appeared that the trustees did not proceed with sufficient zeal to satisfy their constituents. "When we saw," says a journeyman, "that they did not advance, and as we knew the evils arising therefrom, and we should therefore become breadless," the workmen took the affair into their own hands, petitioned parliament by themselves, and appointed their own agents.

§ 44. In 1803 the clothworkers and weavers again formed an institution; all the journeymen joined it, and contributed to its funds. Other trades also contributed to the funds, and many of the home-working masters, even some of the wealthy ones, joined the Institution so as to push forward measures in parliament, inasmuch as the trustees seemed to have given the matter up. The Institution spent from £10,000 to £12,000 on petitions to parliament.

§ 45. The chief object of the Institution, according to the "Rules and Orders of the Clothiers' Community, 1803," was to carry out the legal regulations as to apprentices, in their original integrity. At the same time it was declared that those who until now had carried on the trade, although contrary to these regulations, should continue without molestation. The action of the society was to extend only to the future. Henceforth all apprentices were to be considered unlawful who had not been bound by indenture for seven years. Their term of servitude was to expire on or before their majority. The only exception made was in the case of a son of a lawful workman who had served his father for seven years.

§ 46. No one was to learn two trades at once, and the regulations of 37 Ed. III. c. 5 were to be maintained, with

regard to the workmen of other trades. The rules also complain that the abuses which had arisen, especially the large number of hands who had been driven into the trade, had destroyed the mutual dependence between masters and men, and had produced pride and overbearing on the part of the masters.

§ 47. In addition to the above-named objects, the Institution provided for the maintenance of the sick, and of the widows of deceased members, under conditions generally similar to those still in force in trade unions, except that the necessary funds were collected, in every single case, in the name of the sick member, or of the widow of the deceased, as is often done now by what is called a "benefit."

§ 48. In Leeds, the contribution of each member was 1*d.* a week, and at Halifax 3*d.* Twice a year a committee of thirteen was elected by the members, at a general meeting, to manage the affairs of the Institution, seven of whom were to form a quorum. Fines were imposed for not accepting office when chosen; on resigning, the committee had to render an account of their doings. The stewards had to collect the contributions, and to provide assistance for the sick. The committee had the right to alter the rules according to circumstances; but if any cause of complaint arose, either as to apprentices or as to some other rule, the men of the workshop were first to inquire into the case, and to try and arrange the difficulty; wherever they did not succeed, the matter was to be brought before the committee, whose decision was to be final. All offences at meetings, by using bad language, ill-behaviour, and the like, were to be punished by fine.

§ 49. When those masters who had joined the Institution found that its object was to petition parliament for the maintenance of 5 Eliz. c. 4, they left the society, and tried to force their workmen to leave it also; on their refusing to do so, they were all discharged. The manufacturers then entered into combinations for the purpose of suppressing the Institution, which, notwithstanding 39 and 40 Geo. III. c. 106, was considered allowable by the parliamentary committee, although its members were opposed to the Institution.

§ 50. The workmen at some places forced owners of mills,

who worked for others on hire, to enter their society; on their refusal to do so, the workmen declined to work for them. They also hindered the mill-owners from working for such masters as were hostile to the Institution. Once when a master manufacturer employed "unlawful workers," his journeymen struck work; the other masters promised their colleague assistance, and offered to do his work for him in the meantime. But when they attempted to do this, all their journeymen threatened to leave their factories at once. The final result of this contest was that the masters signed a contract, binding themselves to engage no more workmen, for the future, contrary to 5 Eliz. c. 4.

§ 51. When it was found that the Acts for regulating the woollen manufactures were suspended year after year, notwithstanding the petitions of the workmen, the exasperation was so great that a factory was burnt down; and in September, 1805, the London fire insurance companies received letters of caution from the workmen, wherein it was declared that, as parliament refused to protect their rights, they would do so themselves. But when, at Christmas, 1805, the trustees of the cloth-halls again took up the question, the society was dissolved, and the funds were delivered up to the trustees. It is evident, from ascertained facts, that the sole object of the Institution was the maintenance of the then existing legal and customary regulations of trade; when the State ceased to maintain the statutory regulations, other forces were employed; but as soon as there was even a prospect of a more legitimate authority putting the law into practice, the Institution ceased at once to exist.

§ 52. As a result of these contentions, another committee of the House of Commons was appointed, in 1806, the members of which were not at all favourable to the cause of the workmen. As Adam Smith rightly states, "whenever the legislature attempts to regulate the differences between masters and workmen, its counsellors are always the masters." The report of the committee speaks of the followers of the Institution as "poor deluded wretches," and regards it as an especial fault of the Institution, that "its inevitable, though gradual, result must be, the progressive rise of wages among all classes of

workmen." The petitions for the maintenance of the existing laws were met with this naïve consolation, that the advantages of the domestic system of manufacture were so great that it could never be supplanted by the factory system; and, as a further salve to their feelings they were referred to the "true principles of commerce, which are now so generally understood and acknowledged." But the committee only accepted these principles of Adam Smith with certain conditions, for they recommended at the same time the maintenance of the laws prohibiting the export of raw materials and of machinery, the emigration of skilled workmen to foreign countries, and also combinations of workmen at home, although the masters were allowed to combine.

§ 53. The reasons of the committee for advising the repeal of 5 Eliz. c. 4, appear to have been that its "maintenance would put the determination of the price of labour in the power of those who had the means of working," as expressed by one of its members. The report, however, exonerates the Institution from complicity in the acts of violence before referred to, which must be charged to individuals only. One master says, in evidence, that the attachment of the members to their trade society was so great that if it were prohibited, they would rather follow it than the laws of the land. The Act of 12 Geo. I. c. 34, for suppressing combinations among workmen, had therefore obviously failed.

§ 54. The shipwrights of Liverpool had formed themselves into a trade society, under the cover of a benefit society, early in the last century; it was established chiefly in consequence of the abuse of employing too many apprentices. This society became so prominently political, that it was subsidised by both political parties, on the eve of an election. In 1790, when the two political parties, to avoid a contest, came to an agreement to elect their old members, the shipwrights refused to be bound by the compact, and they started their own candidate, and carried him, against both factions combined. In 1824, the monthly subscription, it appears, was 1*s.* 3*d.*, in which year the balance in hand was £2,200, which sum was spent in building almshouses for old members. This society was so well organised

and powerful, and its rules were so stringent, that a master in resisting its dictates was ruined, and had to make a public apology to the men in the newspapers, for the attitude he had taken, before he could restart his business.

§ 55. Among the hatters, trade societies had existed from an early date. Besides being under 5 Eliz. c. 4, the hat trade was regulated by 8 Eliz. c. 11, and 1 James I. c. 14, which confirmed the provisions of the statute of apprentices, expressly for that trade. This industry was carried on early in the eighteenth century by sub-contractors, called "little masters," who received the materials from the master-manufacturers, and then had them worked up by apprentices only. This led to combinations among the journeymen, which from 1772 became extremely vigorous, their objects being to maintain the existing law, and to protect the interests of the operatives. The society was regulated by statutes and bye-laws, all the workmen in the trade were compelled to belong to it, the contributions being twopence weekly. When the employers attempted to give work to sub-contractors, the men by strikes forced them to take it back. As the workmen prevented the masters from employing an excessive number of apprentices, the masters petitioned parliament, in 1777, for the repeal of the legal restrictions as to apprentices, and for the prohibition of combinations of journeymen. Both requests were granted, by 17 Geo. III. c. 55, but all the restrictions were not by this Act repealed, for every master hatter was still to employ one journeyman for every apprentice.

§ 56. In the tailors' trade combinations also existed, early in the eighteenth century, as by 7 Geo. I. c. 13, they were forbidden. It is probable that these were called into existence in consequence of the legal regulations as to fixing wages, by the justices of the peace, being discontinued, for the preamble of 8 Geo. III. c. 17, speaks of those who, by "many subtle devices," tried to evade the regulations of wages by the justices, according to 7 Geo. I. c. 13, by which words masters are evidently meant, for the devices of the workmen in this trade would have been simply strikes, at that date. Moreover, clause 2 of the Act refers specifically to "master taylors," and enacts regulations pertaining to them.

PART III.—TRADES INCORPORATED BY CHARTER.

§ 57. The trade of framework knitting was not established in the year 5th of Elizabeth, and therefore did not come under the regulations of that statute until 1663, when Charles II. incorporated "several persons by the name of master, warden, assistants, and society, of the art and mystery of framework knitters, of the cities of London and Westminster, the kingdom of England, and dominion of Wales, for ever, with power to exercise their jurisdiction throughout England and Wales; and from time to time to make bye-laws for the regulation of the said business of framework knitting, and to punish persons who should offend against such bye-laws." By section 33 of the charter the master was directed to "enforce the statute 5 Eliz. c. 4, or any other statute as respects apprentices and the occupations of the trade." But the execution of the ordinances of this charter depended upon the masters and wardens of the company, who were the employers, and consequently such ordinances were not made operative to the same extent as they would have been if the statute of apprentices had directly applied to this trade. As early as the beginning of the eighteenth century, the masters employed an unlimited number of apprentices, often in the proportion of ten or more to one journeyman; and one master is mentioned in the reports of the time who for thirty years had employed constantly twenty-five apprentices to one journeyman. This abuse of power, in the absence of fixed legal restrictions, is not surprising, for, besides the lesser wages paid to an apprentice, the parish authorities often paid bounties to the amount of £5 for every boy taken from the workhouse, who was apprenticed.

§ 58. By this system, the adult workers, immediately after the expiration of their apprenticeship, fell into deep distress and misery. In 1710 they therefore petitioned the company to carry out the regulations of the charter with regard to apprentices, but this the company refused to do.

§ 59. The refusal was followed by a strike and riot of the workmen, who in their frantic rage destroyed about 100 frames,

threw them out of the windows, and thrashed the opposing masters and their apprentices. Upon this, the frightened masters gave in, and humbly promised to observe for the future the ordinances of the charter with regard to apprentices. Notwithstanding this promise, the system of taking parish apprentices was continued until the trade was so overstocked with journeymen, without employment, that the most serious revolts ensued. This led, in 1727, to the passing of an Act prohibiting, under penalty of death, the breaking of frames, which had constituted the men's chief method of revenging themselves on their masters.

§ 60. The overstocking of this trade with parish apprentices who, having served their term, found insufficient employment, brought them, in the years 1740 to 1750, near to starvation. "There was often only one coat in a shop, which was worn by each in turn, as he went out from its precincts; so that one, Moss, a Northamptonshire master, refused to employ a man who possessed a good coat, declaring that the best workmen were only to be found in ragged ones."

§ 61. On May 22, 1745, the company ordained new bye-laws, which were confirmed by the Lord Chancellor, in accordance with the provisions of 19 Hen. VII. c. 7, enacting once more the old restrictions as to apprentices. These bye-laws contain the first direct intimation of a practice, which was afterwards to bring such infinite misery on the workmen, namely, of owners of frames, though not themselves following the trade, letting the frames out on hire.* The company, however, did nothing further than attempt to enforce its authority in various parts of the country, mainly in favour of the London employers.

§ 62. As this trade of framework knitting was now being removed from London to Nottingham, the company sent its deputies there to maintain its privileges, but the manufacturers refused to acknowledge its authority. These employers, for the most part, had not served a legal apprenticeship, they also employed journeymen who had not done so, and who did not

* The Act finally abolishing frame-rent charges was only passed in 1874—37 and 38 Vict. c. 48.

belong to or recognise the company; and they furthermore employed a large number of women and children; as regards two employers mentioned, we are told, that one worked with twenty-three, the other with forty-nine, apprentices, without employing any journeymen. The company, relying on its ordinances, confirmed by the Lord Chancellor, threatened to enforce the submission of these masters at law. But its former conduct towards the petitions of the journeymen, in 1710, and its own degeneracy, were now revenged upon itself. The retort on it was, that its own members did not maintain the seven years' apprenticeship, as a qualification for trade, and that instead of preventing frauds, they committed them themselves. The fact was, their whole proceeding was nothing but a trick, the outgrowth of envy; the company having entirely lost all influence with the manufacturers.

§ 63. The company thereupon addressed a special appeal to the men, asked them to join, made the terms of entrance easier, promised to re-establish the old order of things, and designated themselves the true friends of the workmen, and charged the other employers with being their enemies. The journeymen took the bait, and hailed with joy the proceedings of the company. The master manufacturers being threatened with law-suits, petitioned parliament for relief, and accused the company of ruining trade by its monopolies. As parliament was of the same opinion, the company became unable legally to enforce its bye-laws, and thenceforth, although still existing as a body, it ceased to exercise any real influence over the trade.

§ 64. The enormous increase of framework knitting from 1750 to 1780, did not much profit the journeymen, for the trade suffered under the constant influx of boys, girls and non-apprenticed workmen. These abuses had hitherto produced only violent transitory revolts, but when all hope of tangible help from the company had been finally destroyed, the workmen formed a trade union, called the Stocking-makers' Association for Mutual Protection, in the midland counties of England, for the purpose of making regulations as to apprentices, as the legal restrictions were no longer binding, or at least could not be enforced. This society soon became so powerful,

that in Nottingham it greatly influenced the borough elections for parliament.

§ 65. In 1778 Mr. Abel Smith was returned by them without opposition, in celebration of which the members of this association marched in procession before his chair, accompanied by representatives of the London framework knitters' company. "This formerly authoritative body had thus another opportunity given them to have rendered themselves useful, by the adoption of wise and timely measures, mutually beneficial to the master hosiers and their discontented workmen. The imposition of high rents, exacted for the use of frames, and other charges, had not as yet settled into a legalised custom; the best of the journeymen and the wisest of the masters might have been reconciled, and the charter revived; but the time was wasted in squabbles about fees, and the company lost almost its last hold on the trade."

§ 66. The complete abandonment of the workmen by the chartered company to the discretionary power of the employers, notwithstanding the then flourishing state of the trade, plunged them into the greatest misery. In consequence of low wages, the payment of frame-rents, and other charges exacted by the employers, they were unable to maintain themselves and their families. In 1778 they therefore petitioned the House of Commons for a legal regulation of the rates of wages. As the masters made a counter-petition, a committee was appointed to inquire into the complaints of the workmen. The witnesses who were examined confirmed the justice of the journeymen's statements in most particulars. The earnings of a workman were affirmed to be about 6*s.* per week; and the most infamous exactions were made on the part of the employers. Many of them hired workmen without giving them sufficient employment, for the mere purpose of obtaining frame-rents. But, although the report of the committee was in favour of the workmen, the influence of the masters prevailed, and the motion for enacting a law, according to the petition of the journeymen, was lost. Upon this the employers in the silk branch of the trade attempted at once to reduce the price paid for the work 25 per cent., when a strike immediately ensued.

§ 67. On February 2, 1779, the framework-knitters of Nottingham and its environs again petitioned parliament for regulation of the trade. This was followed by similar petitions from Tewkesbury, Godalming, Derby, London, Westminster, and Northampton. Witnesses from all these places were examined by a committee.

§ 68. According to all the witnesses examined, wages had been constantly falling lower and lower during the last twenty years, whilst the prices of food and other necessaries of life had risen; the employers were continually endeavouring to reduce wages. After various deductions, which the workmen had always to submit to, for frame-rents, winding, seaming, needles, candles, etc., their wages are stated in the report as being from 6*s.* to 8*s.* weekly, some not even so much. The most shameless exactions on the part of the masters were enforced against the workmen, the most disgraceful of which were levied in the shape of frame-rents. The value of a frame at that time is stated to have been from £6 to £8, but, for its use, a workman had to pay from 1*s.* 3*d.* to 2*s.* a week, or at the rate of 86 per cent. The workmen were obliged to hire these frames, if they wished to get work; if a workman managed to buy a frame of his own, he was refused work. This rent the workmen had to pay whether they worked or not, even during sickness, or when the employers failed to furnish the materials with which to work. Many employers purposely stinted their workmen, so that they could only make a certain number of stockings a week, so that in this way they might be able to deduct the frame-rent from a greater number of persons, though working on starvation wages.

§ 69. The workmen had to buy the materials from the employers for making the stockings; the latter then re-bought the stockings from the workmen when made; if the goods were not in every sense satisfactory, they were thrown upon the hands of the workmen. The employers were thus secured from all losses, and at the same time ensured full payment for the use of the frames.

§ 70. The workmen, says the report, were in a state of starvation; and they were compelled to submit to any conditions,

however unjust, imposed by the employers. Several workmen who had signed the last year's petition to parliament were discharged. But in Dublin the masters and men had agreed upon a price list which the Lord Mayor had confirmed; it was stated that both parties were now content, that the workmen had been bettered in consequence of the list, and earned more wages. They, therefore, desired that a Bill should be passed fixing the prices which would, as they thought, produce a wholesome effect.

§ 71. On this report the House resolved that a Bill should be introduced for regulating the trade of framework knitting, and for preventing frauds and abuses therein. Mr. Meadows, one of the members for Nottinghamshire, brought in the Bill on May 10, 1779, which was strenuously supported by Mr. Robert Smith (afterwards Lord Carrington), who said "the measure was moistened and saturated by the tears of the poor distressed families of the framework-knitters." Leave was given to bring in the Bill, with only one dissentient.

§ 72. Upon this the employers presented counter-petitions, alleging that if the Bill became law it would be most injurious to the petitioners, and to the wholesale merchants in framework knitting. The result of this was the appointment of another committee to inquire into the condition of the workmen; on June 9 they reported that the former statements of the workmen were true, and proposed only a few alterations in the Bill.

§ 73. The second reading was carried by only twenty-four against twenty-three; but on the third reading it was thrown out by fifty-two to eighteen. The masters' influence thus appeared to be paramount not only in repealing the legislation of the past, but in resisting legislation, for the benefit of the workmen, in the present.

§ 74. Upon the rejection of the Bill the greatest excitement among the work-people ensued. They crowded into Nottingham, broke the frames of those manufacturers by whose special influence the Bill was rejected and of many other employers, threw the broken frames out of the windows, burned a house down, and destroyed much property belonging to em-

ployers and others in the town. More than 300 frames are stated to have been broken on this occasion. The whole of the employers then promised, if the riots would at once cease, to remove all grievances; on this, peace was restored. On this occasion public opinion seems to have been on the side of the workmen, for a journeyman who was accused of having set fire to a house was acquitted. But the masters again failed to keep their word; they formed a union of their own, and after the ferment had subsided they issued an address in which they stated that they would oppose all regulations, whether by charter, or Acts of parliament, as tending to drive the manufacture to France, where the workmen were contented with low wages.

§ 75. The grievances of the workmen in this trade not only continued, but increased more and more. From 1780, in consequence of the system of frame-rent charges being established, the construction of machinery proceeded very rapidly for the next thirty years. The actual cost of the frames bore so small a proportion to the rent, as to induce many persons not in the trade to purchase them, and embark in the business. With this came a vast increase in the number of apprentices; one manufacturer in Nottingham, in 1810, had twenty-four, and two at Hinchley had as many as one hundred between them. The whole district was accordingly in a constant state of riot. In their distress the workmen once more turned their attention to the chartered London company, and sought its intervention for their relief. But it was too late for its action to be of any practical service—it did, however, proceed at law against a manufacturer for taking apprentices in violation of the bye-laws of the company, but the employer was only condemned in 1*s.* damages. Every effort to effect protection by law utterly failed.

§ 76. As wages became more and more dependent on the will and discretion of the employers, the workmen applied again to parliament, in 1812, to enforce payment by statement lists; but though a Bill embodying such clauses passed the Commons, it was thrown out by the Lords. After this attempt and failure, the workmen, in 1814, entered into a

union, formed of all branches of the trade, and efforts were, from time to time, made, to fix a statement list of prices; and strikes were often resorted to when the masters violated the well-understood conditions of the trade. Some further applications were also made to parliament for laws to regulate the trade, but without success. The London company, having lost all power, ceased to exist in 1835; the workmen, however, meanwhile continued their combinations.

§ 77. Another of the incorporated trades was the cutlers of Sheffield, where the masters, before 1790, attempted to violate the customary restrictions as to apprentices, but were probably hindered by the journeymen. The masters here, however, did not withdraw from the corporation, but complained, in 1790, of these restrictions to parliament, and petitioned for some relaxations in the bye-laws of the company. These were granted in an Act of June 7, 1791. On September 9 of the same year we find combinations among the scissor-grinders, and other workmen. On April 3, 1792, the scissor-smiths' benefit society was formed; it was a trade society, established to oppose the action of the employers, but took the form of a friendly society, thereby eluding by anticipation the provisions of 39 and 40 Geo. III. c. 106.

PART IV.—TRADES FREE FROM RESTRICTION EITHER BY STATUTE OR CHARTER.

§ 78. It appears that the compositors and printers were among the first to combine for the protection of their interests as a trade, and for enforcing, as was then usual, both by law and custom, certain restrictions as to the number of apprentices. Mr. C. J. Drummond has in his possession some rules, dated 1792, relating to a union called "The Phœnix, or Society of Compositors," instituted March 12th, 1792, at the "Hole in the Wall," Fleet Street. But long before this, in 1785, rules were in force, agreed to by the employers and their employés, fixing, at the request of the journeymen, the rates of pay for compositors' work. In the year 1798, a

prosecution was instituted against five members of the Pressmen's Friendly Society—the secretary, and four members of the committee—for conspiracy, on the allegation that they "did unlawfully meet together, to restrain and injure the master printers, by restricting the number of apprentices," etc. The defendants pleaded, among other things, that the Stationers' Company, at a court held on March 7th, 1775, had endeavoured to do, and did actually do, what the men were prosecuted for doing. At that meeting, complaints were made that some masters of the company had been binding too many apprentices; whereupon the court ordered: "That, for the future, every master before he binds an apprentice, shall send into court, in writing, to the Master, a list of the apprentices he has at such time in his service." The men endeavoured to fix *three* apprentices to *seven* presses. For this "conspiracy," the five men were each sentenced to two years' imprisonment in Newgate, although they attended the meeting, alleged to be unlawful, at the request of the secretary of the Society of Master Printers, on the subject of the dispute then existing with respect to apprentices, with a view to the settlement of the dispute, their conduct there and otherwise being without reproach.

§ 79. The same regulations which were observed in the trades under 5 Elizabeth, or those incorporated by charter, were in force, as the outgrowth of law and custom, in those which had always been free from legal restrictions. Among these was the trade of calico-printers. Although the statute of apprentices did apply to this trade, its regulations were carried out by the general custom, and with the sanction of the trade, until the introduction of machinery, in 1790, when an unlimited number of apprentices were employed in the place of adult journeymen. As there were no legal restrictions, there could be no prosecutions, and hence the disproportion between the number of journeymen and of apprentices surpassed that existing in any other trade. In Lancashire there were cases of fifty-five apprentices to two journeymen, and in Dumbarton of sixty to two; in other places the numbers were similar. These disproportions were not caused by any scarcity of adult

labour, for whilst the apprentices were working full time in the factories, the journeymen sought in vain for work. Moreover, whenever there was a discharge of hands, the journeymen had to leave, while the apprentices remained with full employment. The obvious reason for this was, that the masters, by employing apprentices instead of journeymen, saved thereby one-third in wages; and it often happened "that apprentices were discharged immediately upon the expiration of their apprenticeship, although the work was unfinished, the masters being unwilling to pay them journeymen's wages, even until such work was finished."

§ 80. Against the evil consequences naturally to be apprehended from the comparative unskilfulness of boys, the masters provided, by making, at their discretion, an adequate deduction from their wages whenever the work was spoilt by the boys. The employers, as a rule, declined taking apprentices on indenture, and accepted them only on verbal promises of serving for seven years. To enforce the observance of this agreement, they required from the parents or guardians of the boy a bond for £50, and they also retained a certain portion of the earnings until the term agreed upon had elapsed. Often the apprentices had to serve from eight to ten years instead of seven, for when at any time the employer had no work for his apprentice, he forced him to serve beyond his term, to make up for the time lost when he had no work to do. The employer, however, did not take upon himself any legal obligation whatever towards his apprentices, he could discharge them at will, and very often did so. In fact, the position of apprentices was as precarious as the situation of journeymen was miserable. These apprentices were partly parish apprentices, and partly children of workmen who were forced by employers to consent by threats of instant dismissal if they refused so to apprentice their children.

§ 81. This occupation "produced among the generality of workers a great difficulty of breathing, diseases of the lungs, etc., and their sight was apt to fail them at an early age, and the period of old age very soon reached them." They thus became unfit for any other employment, though they were

mostly discharged at the expiration of their apprenticeship; and those workers whose sight failed them were immediately dismissed.

§ 82. This excessive exercise of power on the part of the masters, and their aggressions, especially on the journeymen's customary right of preference to employment, which they had acquired by a regular apprenticeship, led to the formation of the calico-printers' trade society, to which all journeymen of the trade belonged. At first there were no regular obligatory payments, but all voluntarily contributed to a common fund, out of which sick members and those out of work were assisted. When the accumulation of such funds was prohibited by 39 and 40 Geo. III. c. 106, in 1800, the members of this union gave each member a ticket which entitled him, on its presentation, to receive a donation from the workers in any workshop which he passed. The voluntary system was subsequently changed into a weekly contribution. From various causes this union ceased to comprehend all the workers in the trade, and it became a close and restricted association of the more zealous of the journeymen. One of their rules was that an apprentice, or workman, who wished to work in a workshop, had first to apply to the journeymen before asking the masters for work; the object of this was to ascertain if discontent existed, or if work was plentiful, so as to prevent employers taking advantage of the new offer of labour to discharge their journeymen, or reduce their wages. If the custom of the trade with regard to apprentices was broken, a strike ensued; the apprentices generally went out with the journeymen and were assisted by them. In London, and the districts adjacent thereto, it appears that the most friendly relations existed between the masters and workmen, for the proportion between apprentices and journeymen was at a minimum. In other districts this was not the case.

§ 83. These combinations continued until 1802, when the journeymen applied to parliament for redress, and "the moment they found their petition entertained, and felt any ground of hope that their grievances would be fairly considered, all combinations ceased, and their reliance for redress was entirely founded upon the justice and liberality of parliament."

§ 84. A committee was appointed in 1802, by the House of Commons, and evidence was taken, and, in their report, they warmly recommended measures for the relief of the calico-printers. They especially pointed out that recent legislation for the working classes "had operated only in favour of the strong and against the weak. Everything is made subservient to the interest of the masters, and exclusively too; for the diminution of expense, considerable as it is, the manufacture arising out of their multiplication of apprentices at reduced wages, and the introduction of machinery, do not appear to have produced any reduction whatever in the price of the fabric to the consumer."

§ 85. In accordance with the recommendations in this report Mr. Sheridan brought in a Bill proposing, among other things, to lessen the number of apprentices. Sir Robert Peel, himself a Lancashire manufacturer, whose manufactory, like that of other employers, was overstocked with apprentices, vehemently opposed the Bill, and it was refused a second reading. This refusal caused a revival of the calico-printers' union; and later on the apprentices themselves, in consequence of their precarious situation, formed a union of their own, to assist and supplement the trade society of the journeymen in their efforts to improve their condition.

§ 86. The cotton trades were too recent in their origin to be under 5 Eliz. c. 4, but from the earliest dates they had their unions. According to the evidence contained in the parliamentary report on the petitions of several weavers, in 1811, it appears that statement lists of prices had existed for at least seventy years in this trade; these were mutually agreed upon by masters and men, and great misery had been caused to the workmen by these lists having been given up thirteen years before that date.

§ 87. In the silk trades the custom of assessing wages by the justices of the peace, or by the lord mayor, had fallen into disuse in London, Westminster, and Middlesex before 1773; and in consequence of the competition of employers, and their attempts to undersell each other, the wages of the workmen had been considerably reduced. This led to continual disputes as to wages, and strikes became frequent, the men being assisted

by all the workmen in the trade. In several instances deeds of violence were committed by the exasperated workmen, and much property was destroyed, particularly such as belonged to employers who would not pay the customary wages.

§ 88. The society instituted in this trade was governed by a committee of management; when the committee ordered a levy of 2*d.* for every loom used by a workman, quarrels with the masters ensued, which finally led to the enactment of 13 Geo. III. c. 68, according to which the justices of the peace, or the lord mayor, were from July 1, 1773, and from time to time, after demand to do so had been made to them, to assess the wages of journeymen in the silk manufacture. Employers giving more or less than the assessed wages to their workmen, or otherwise evading the Act, as well as journeymen entering into combinations to raise wages, were to pay certain fines, the amount of which, after deducting the necessary expenses, was to be applied to the relief of needy silk-weavers and their families. By 32 Geo. III. c. 44, these regulations were extended to the manufactories of silk mixed with other materials; and by 51 Geo. III. c. 7, to the female workers in the respective trades. These are known as the Spitalfields Acts.

§ 89. These enactments put an end to strikes, and masters and men were unanimous in their praise of the effects of these Acts. In 1795 a general price list was fixed in conformity with the provisions of 13 Geo. III. c. 68; this was followed by several others agreed upon up to 1806. The expense of the publication of these lists was defrayed by the subscriptions of the workmen; but as all journeymen did not contribute fairly and equally, the men in 1805 elected a "committee of ways and means," which levied contributions according to the number of looms worked by each journeyman. As the masters frequently endeavoured to violate the lists agreed upon, further subscriptions were required, first to assist those workmen who had been discharged for insisting on their lawful wages, until they again obtained work; and then for prosecuting before the justices those employers who had violated the law; this led to a federation of the more zealous journeymen into a trade society, called the "Good Intent."

§ 90. Strikes were not the object of the society, for the journeymen could protect their interests at law. If members were out of work, they were assisted; if differences broke out between masters and men, a committee was appointed to effect a settlement, which committee was dissolved after the case had been decided. The committee prosecuted the masters who had violated the Acts, and represented the journeymen whenever a new price list had to be fixed.

§ 91. The employers also formed a society, with the object of defending its members in court when prosecuted, and to represent them in the preparation and settlement of any new price list. These revised lists were settled by the two committees, and were afterwards sanctioned by the justices. Sometimes these prices were disputed before the court, but, on the evidence of a manufacturer, it appears that these disputes were mostly occasioned by those masters only who were not operative weavers, and did not fully understand the trade or its requirements. According to an address issued by the society, these lists had been the means of obtaining for the members the lawful prices for their work, which previously had been withheld from them, to a very great extent, by the employers.

§ 92. The condition of things in the silk trades, notwithstanding all the legal enactments, grew worse year by year, until it had become altogether untenable, for whilst the law was nominally in force, it was not observed in practice. Contests and litigations continually embittered the strife, and all parties at last agreed that a new law of some kind was indispensable. But whilst some wished for the amendment of the statute on the old lines, others desired its entire repeal. Petitions representing both those views were presented to parliament; those in favour of maintaining the statute numbered 300,000, those for its repeal were 2,000 only.

§ 93. In 1813 a parliamentary committee was appointed to inquire into the whole question. All the witnesses examined were opposed to repeal; the arguments of the workmen brought round to their views even the chairman of the committee, who had been formerly opposed to them. The workmen's petitions laid particular stress on the point that, by the laws which had

hitherto prevailed, the journeymen, lawfully educated for their trade, had acquired a right analogous to that relating to property, and that the repeal of the statute of Elizabeth would be to them what the deprivation of land or other property would be to the owners thereof, hitherto protected by law. And were they not right? Land is the acquired right of the owners for the purposes of income; the journeymen by their seven years' apprenticeship, and the expenses of their education in learning the trade, had similarly acquired a right, and yet compensations are paid to the one class when those rights are interfered with by law, and not to the other. The rights of capital are acknowledged when they are fixed in saleable commodities; why not when comprised in labour, which, it is said by political unionists, is also a saleable commodity?

§ 94. Notwithstanding the opposition of the workmen, and in spite of the overwhelming evidence against repeal, the master manufacturers obtained the victory in 1814, when, after a contest of nearly one hundred years, the 5 Eliz. c. 4 was abrogated by 54 Geo. III. c. 96, and the industrial system, which was as old as the craft-guilds, was abolished for all trades, as it had been previously as regards the woollen manufactures. The chief reason for the repeal of this statute, on the part of the employers, was that the seven years' apprenticeship restricted the number of workmen, and thereby enabled them to combine with success against their masters; they asserted that "the persons most competent to form regulations with respect to the trade were the master manufacturers;" thus the statute was repealed in the interests solely of the employers. Political economists assert that labour is a commodity, and that it is governed by natural laws like any other commodity; in all other cases the price of commodities is fixed by the seller, not the buyer; why was this refused in the case of labour? But this question will be discussed further on.

§ 95. The petitions in favour of repeal, as before stated, were signed by 2,000 persons, those against repeal by 300,000, the expressed will of the majority of those interested in the question was therefore disregarded, and the opinions of the minority were accepted and acted upon. The workmen had

no voice in this interference with long established law and custom; the employers, on the other hand, were well represented and all powerful. The cause of the workmen was pleaded with great eloquence by Mr. Sheridan; but the employers alone had the power of deciding, and they were at that time not controlled by any popular franchise or vote. The immediate effect of the repeal of this statute was the complete disorganisation of the industrial condition of the workers in all trades affected, for, by the growth of a system of "sweating" and of half-pay apprentices, the journeymen were driven to famine, and the female workers to prostitution. "Whilst the statute of 5 Eliz. c. 4 was in force, the distressing circumstances now complained of never occurred," says the report of 1818.

§ 96. In consequence of this distressed state of trade in the silk manufactures, the whole of the masters and men petitioned parliament in 1818 for the extension of the Spitalfields Acts to the silk trade, in the districts of Coventry, Macclesfield, and Nuneaton, but without avail. As the justices of the peace no longer assessed wages, the workmen tried to introduce the system of regulating wages by statement lists of prices, mutually agreed upon by masters and men, but these were violated upon every occasion by the employers. Precisely similar was the condition of the watchmakers of Coventry in the years 1817 and 1818.

§ 97. The words spoken by Mr. Pitt, on the subject of the Arbitration Act, were now completely fulfilled, and deserve to be quoted for the edification of many of his would-be followers even at this date. "The time will come," he said, "when manufactures will have been so long established, and the operatives not having any other business to flee to, that it will be in the power of any one man in a town to reduce the wages, and all the other manufacturers must follow. If ever it does arrive at this pitch, parliament, if it be not then sitting, ought to be called together, and if it cannot redress your grievances, its power is at an end. Tell me not that parliament cannot—its power is omnipotent to protect."*

* See speech of Mr. Maxwell, House of Commons, May 15th, 1834—Hand-loom weavers' petition. Hansard, New Series, Vol. XXIII. p. 1091.

§ 98. So thought the workmen, and they petitioned accordingly for the restitution of those ancient legal regulations; but parliament refused; they therefore tried self-help by associative effort, and hence arose combinations of workmen in all the chief trades of the time. The workmen were now placed in a position of positive injustice, for they were refused legal protection on the one hand, and, on the other, the means of self-help, in the shape of combination, was denied to them, and punished as a crime, by 39 and 40 Geo. III. c. 106. Employers could, and did, combine; but the workmen dared not do so publicly, and in the face of open day, as they ought to have been permitted to do, and hence arose trade unions, which were at first partially of a secret character. The secrecy of the earlier unions has been universally, but under the circumstances unjustly, condemned—unjustly because they were compelled to secrecy by repressive laws.

§ 99. Secret societies are the natural result of repression; they arise out of a sense of injustice and oppression, strengthened by the conviction that they dare not publicly discuss their grievances, real or imaginary, and that the government under which this state of things exists are opposed to the interests of those who compose such societies. Secret combinations are incompatible with free government, and cannot possibly find any large class of adherents; but tyranny and oppression will always produce men who will not be deterred, by any consideration of danger, from combining to resist what they deem an injustice.

§ 100. The enactment of the combination laws, therefore, did not prevent combination, but tended to develop it. In 1818, a common workman was prosecuted for combining, and bail to the amount of £200 and two sureties of £100 each were required for his appearance at the next sessions to answer the charge; but these prosecutions did not deter others from combining. The effects of these laws were such that the people in their despair were led to commit the grossest deeds of violence and the most infamous crimes, in what they considered to be self-defence. The whole character of the workpeople had so deteriorated that they regarded with little aversion

acts which were not only vicious, but actually criminal. Similar circumstances have produced similar results in recent times, both in this country and on the Continent, so slow are we to take to heart the lessons, and benefit by the experience of, history.

§ 101. The most serious of these outrages occurred during the years 1819, 1820, and 1823, in Glasgow, Paisley, and the surrounding districts ; but the witnesses of the operatives who were examined denied that the unions had anything to do with the outrages. The fatal frequency and systematic character of these acts of terrorism, however, bear evidence to the fact of a concerted plan, although the number of those who took part in them might have been comparatively few.

PART V.—THE RAPID GROWTH OF TRADE UNIONS DURING THE PRESENT CENTURY.

§ 102. The preceding sketch supplies ample evidence with regard to the condition of the workmen in the several handicrafts of the country ; of their sufferings during the period of transition from a small to a great industry ; from a system of domestic manufacture to factory life ; of their frantic struggles to maintain the old system and methods, and failing that, to mitigate the severity of the new conditions, and afford protection to those who were thrown upon the tender mercies of the new class of capitalists, who were then rising into power. With regard to the origin of trade unions, it has been shown that they arose out of the attempts that were made to abolish the old order of things, together with the long established customs in the several trades, and with it, moreover, the legal protection which had hitherto been relied on by the workmen as a safeguard against the encroachments of capital.

§ 103. Under the craft-guilds they had been protected to a certain extent by customs and laws mutually established between masters and journeymen ; by the statute of apprentices this protection had been, at a subsequent period, sanctioned and guaranteed by law ; with the abrogation of that law the position of the small masters and that of the journeymen was alike menaced, their prospects being rendered doubtful and

insecure; the security of the poorer class of workers and the situation of the well-to-do small masters were similarly jeopardised. The development of the factory system destroyed whatever harmony was still left between masters and workmen, and the antagonisms which arose in consequence produced nothing but anarchy, until combinations of the workmen grew up, which tended to some extent to restore an equilibrium of the industrial forces. After the repeal of 5 Eliz. c. 4, the necessity for organisation among the workmen became more and more apparent, and hence they combined more rapidly, and with more distinctive objects than before.

§ 104. Trade unions were formed for the purpose of resisting the aggressions of the rising manufacturers, and to prevent the spread of the gross abuses which naturally resulted from the disintegration of labour, caused by a new system, under new conditions, and governed by a new class. The primary object of the unions was the maintenance of the independence of the workmen, and the consolidation of their order, just as the Frith-guilds formed a kind of barrier against the tyranny of mediæval magnates, and as the craft-guilds opposed the aggressions of the old burghers. The journeymen only resorted to combinations as a means of self-help, when legal aid was denied to them, and when there was no other preventive power between them and industrial slavery. The earlier associations had been formed for the purpose of enforcing the laws as they then stood, such were those of the clothworkers, the hatters, the calico-printers, the silk-weavers, etc. When it was found that the legally established companies or societies failed to maintain intact the regulations and customs of the several trades, other associations were formed for the purpose of continuing the industrial warfare, and protecting the interests of the journeymen. Originally all the craftsmen in the trade belonged to the society lawfully established for their mutual protection; their contributions were in a sense voluntary, or levied according to the varying necessities of the hour; but changed conditions gave to these associations of workmen new forms of life, the full maturity of which are as yet scarcely seen, not even by the experiences of 1889 and 1890.

§ 105. When these combinations became more frequent, and their actions more important and defiant, it was thought that the power possessed by the criminal courts for dealing with their proceedings was either too uncertain, or too dilatory for the purpose of suppressing them; and accordingly as strikes occurred in particular trades, the legislature was called upon to apply more effectual remedies. The result was that many statutes were passed during the latter part of the last century for the protection of employers in different trades. These statutes, generally called the "combination laws," prohibited all agreements, or associations of workmen, for the purpose of advancing wages, or controlling their masters in the management and regulation of their business, and empowered the magistrates to convict summarily, and punish with imprisonment for two or three months, any workman who should take part in them. After the prohibition of all combinations, only the more zealous and fearless openly combined; but under the cloak of friendly societies many associations were formed, fixed payments being demanded, just as in the Middle Ages political associations were formed under the cloak of religious guilds: secrecy was the child of suppression; the legislature forged at once the chains of the workmen, and the weapons for their deliverance.

§ 106. The rules of the earlier societies were necessarily crude and imperfect, they show indeed but the merest outlines of an organisation; many of them were designed only as temporary expedients for present purposes, and for the emergencies which gave rise to them. The articles of these associations were perfected more and more as time went on, and as occasion required, until some of them more than realised the ideas of the later craft-guilds, and were elaborated into the almost perfect form which we now find in the modern trade unions. The germ of federation is to be found in some of the earlier trades' movements, but it was short-lived, and was sternly put down by law. A faint outline of amalgamation can also be traced, but the Corresponding Societies' Acts rudely put an end to that idea, and it had to be abandoned.

§ 107. When the journeymen found that they were denied the protection of the law, and dared not openly combine, they

tried to fix a statement list of prices; this the employers also opposed, as, in their opinion, they alone had the right to fix the price of labour, and the terms upon which journeymen should work. The idea of arbitration was also broached, but it was equally unsuccessful; the modern methods of procedure by courts of arbitration is, however, but an amended method of the ordinances of craft-guilds for the regulation of wages, and the subsequent appeals to the justices to decide between the contending parties. A workman in the silk-weaving trade could obtain an arbitration summons for twopence, on application to the town clerk or magistrates, for the purpose of adjusting any differences as to price, before a magistrate or justice of the peace. None of these things gave permanent relief to the workmen; their condition became worse, and their wages more precarious; distress brought disorder; this in its turn called forth greater efforts for the purpose of inaugurating associations which should replace the old guilds, embracing all those belonging to the craft, and whose objects should be either to maintain the old order of things, or create a new order, more suited to the times, and the circumstances of each particular handicraft.

§ 108. That these efforts were to some extent successful is proved by the fact that at the commencement of the present century the legislature had discovered not only that strikes were common in almost every trade, but they had also become acquainted with the different purposes for which the associations were formed, the means by which they were supported, and the manner in which they were conducted. The manufacturers, moreover, were not idle; complaints against the workmen were abundant enough, and accordingly, in the year 1800, a statute was passed, 40 Geo. III. c. 106, directed against all associations of workmen established for any and all of these purposes.

By the first section of this statute all agreements between journeymen and workmen for obtaining an advance of wages for themselves or for other workmen, or for lessening the hours of work, or for preventing or hindering any person from employing whomsoever he should think proper to employ, or for

controlling or in any way affecting any person carrying on any manufacture in the conduct and management thereof, were thereby made and declared to be illegal. By the second section, one justice of the peace was empowered to convict summarily, and impose two months' imprisonment upon workmen who should enter into any such agreement. By the third section, the same punishment was to be inflicted upon workmen who should by giving money, or by persuasion, solicitation, or intimidation, or any other means, wilfully and maliciously endeavour to prevent any unhired workman from hiring himself, or hired workman from continuing in his employ; or who should prevent any master from employing such workman as he should think proper; or who, being hired, should without any just cause refuse to work with any other journeyman or workman. By other sections, further provisions were enacted with regard to the funds obtained by workmen to support them during their strikes.

§ 109. This elaborate attempt on the part of the legislature to prevent combinations of workmen, and abolish strikes, was practically its last, for it was soon found that such laws were not only useless, but pernicious. It did not deter the journeymen from combining, but it gave rise to and encouraged secret associations, which are far more mischievous than open combinations can ever be. But if the law was powerless to prevent, it was strong enough to punish; men were always to be found who would brave all the consequences, and risk all the dangers of prosecution and imprisonment, in defence of their right to combine; and hence we find that these combination laws were put in force without mercy, and oftentimes in defiance of justice. In 1805 three linen-weavers of Knaresborough were sent to Wakefield jail for three months, one of them for simply carrying a letter to York, requesting assistance from other workmen. In 1816 three carpenters were sentenced to one month's imprisonment each, and two to twelve months' each; but it appears that in this case some amount of violence had been used. Once, the men in this trade prosecuted the masters for combination, but they failed to obtain a conviction, although the case was fully proved; their counsel was so fully satisfied that they had

been dealt unfairly with, that he felt himself bound to return his fees. In 1820 a dispute arose among the hatters as to wages, consequent upon a change in the shape of hats, whereupon the masters prosecuted twenty-four of the men, although neither violence nor intimidation seems to have occurred in any one case. In one instance a combination of the engineers was suppressed by an appeal to the combination laws; but it did not deter them from combining, nor prevent the different branches of their trades from aiding each other. The tailors managed to avoid prosecution by the discretion with which they acted, for as a body they never discussed the propriety of a strike, through fear of the law; but nevertheless an entire want of confidence so far prevailed between the masters and the journeymen in this trade, that they evinced a decided disposition towards mutual annoyance in all their relationships with each other. The master boot and shoe makers seem to have made a tyrannical use of these laws, although they combined among themselves, and held meetings regularly once every month. In one case when a workman summoned his master for wages due on work already done, the master replied by a summons against the workman under the combination laws. In another instance an employer called nineteen of his workmen together and detained them under the pretence of sending out for beer, instead of which he sent for twenty-four officers to take them into custody. They were all convicted and sentenced to one month's imprisonment, and a fine of 21*s.* each. There was no violence nor intimidation, the men behaving throughout in a perfectly quiet and orderly manner, as appears to have been usually the case in this trade. Among the clothworkers at Leeds and Dewsbury, during the years 1819–23, although the illegality of their combinations was perfectly well known to the men, they observed very little secrecy as to their proceedings, yet not a single master availed himself of the combination laws to repress them, and the magistrates discouraged any idea of their doing so, in fact they even went so far as to exert themselves to try and bring about an arrangement between the two parties when there was a dispute. No serious cases of violence or intimidation occurred on the part of these men during their prolonged

struggles. Among the compositors and printers a still more healthy and better feeling at this time prevailed; this was perhaps due to the fact, that in 1816 the masters stated to their workmen that they had come to the determination not to avail themselves of the combination laws to repress their union. This resolution was communicated to the workmen at a time when differences had arisen as to wages; the result was that a compromise was effected which eventually satisfied both parties. The following curious case occurred in Lancashire. In 1818 one of the factory owners reduced the wages of the weavers 1*d.* per yard. The other masters declared that there was no necessity for this reduction, upon which the weavers combined and regained the penny, and obtained an additional penny advance. Encouraged by this success, they held a deputy meeting and resolved to ask for a further advance of 2*s.* in the pound. Some of the masters had a meeting of their own on the same day, and those who attended agreed to the advance, but proposed that it should take place by instalments. At a meeting of the deputies from Lancashire, Yorkshire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire, this compromise was agreed to. The president of this meeting, Robert Ellison, who had advocated and recommended the above compromise, and also a subsequent resolution, which was favourable to the employers, attended not only with the consent, but at the request of his employer, Mr. White. A fortnight after the resolutions had been agreed to, and all the men had gone back to their work, the president Ellison, and the two secretaries, Richard Kaye and Robert Pilkington, were arrested by a warrant from the Manchester bench of magistrates, and were obliged to find bail to the extent of £400. This was found, Mr. White, the employer of Ellison, procuring bail for him. On surrendering, they were tried on an indictment at common law for conspiracy, Ellison being sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment, although his own employer, in open court, gave evidence on his behalf, and stated moreover that he had himself recommended the obnoxious resolutions; the other two being sentenced to two years' imprisonment each, which they all suffered. Such were the "Combination Laws," and such the conduct of some of the employers.

§ 110. The history of these prosecutions and contentions, and the consequent privations endured by the workmen for the purpose of securing their independence, is a real record of heroism; in spite of oppression the most crushing, of legal enactments the most stringent, of punishments the most cruel, for any infraction of these Acts, the men continued to combine; they contested every inch of the ground, until, after a struggle of centuries, they were now on the threshold of victory, partial it is true, but still most important, viewed by the light of later facts.

§ 111. These fierce contests had not passed altogether unnoticed, nor had the prosecutions of the workmen by their masters been wholly unheeded; a few men in parliament, with Joseph Hume at their head, had observed their struggles for industrial freedom, and in the year 1824 they moved for and obtained the appointment of a select committee of the House of Commons to consider the laws relating to workmen and artisans. There are men still living who can recollect the time when they had to bury the books and records of their society on the town moor of Bolton in Lancashire, when oaths had to be resorted to, and were administered for the purpose of securing mutual protection; when to ask for a rise of wages, or even to receive an advance if offered, was a violation of the law; strangely as it reads now, the exportation of machinery and the emigration of artisans were alike forbidden; it was to inquire into this state of things that the committee referred to was appointed.

§ 112. The committee sat, took evidence, and speedily returned the following report with reference to these oppressive laws:

(1.) That it appears by the evidence before the committee, that combinations of workmen have taken place in England, Scotland, and Ireland, often to a great extent, to raise and keep up their wages, to regulate their hours of working, and to impose restrictions on their masters respecting apprentices or others whom they might think proper to employ; and that at the time the evidence was taken, combinations were in existence, attended with strikes and suspension of work; and the laws have not hitherto been effectual to prevent such combinations.

(2.) That serious breaches of the peace and acts of violence, with strikes of the workmen, often for very long periods, have

taken place in consequence of and arising out of the combinations of workmen, and have been attended with loss to both masters and workmen, and with considerable inconvenience and injury to the community.

(3.) That the masters have often combined to lower the rates of their workmen's wages, as well to resist a demand for an increase and to regulate their hours of working, and sometimes to discharge their workmen who would not consent to the conditions offered to them, which have been followed by suspension of work, riotous proceedings, and acts of violence.

(4.) That prosecutions have frequently been carried on under the statute and common law against the workmen, and many of them have suffered different periods of imprisonment for combining and conspiring to raise their wages, or to resist their reduction, and to regulate their hours of working.

(5.) That several instances have been stated to the committee of prosecutions against masters for combining to lower wages, and to regulate the hours of working; but no instance has been adduced of any master having been punished for that offence.

(6.) That the laws have not only not been efficient to prevent combinations either of masters or workmen, but on the contrary have, in the opinion of many of both parties, had a tendency to produce mutual irritation and distrust, and to give a violent character to the combinations, and to render them highly dangerous to the peace of the community.

(7.) That it is the opinion of this committee that masters and workmen should be freed from such restrictions as regards the rate of wages and hours of working, and left at perfect liberty to make such agreements as they may mutually think proper.

(8.) That therefore the statute laws that interfere in this particular should be repealed; and also the common law under which a peaceable meeting of masters or workmen may be prosecuted as a conspiracy, should be altered.

(9.) That the committee regret to find from the evidence that societies legally enrolled as benefit societies have been frequently made the cloak under which funds have been raised for the support of combinations and strikes attended with acts of violence or intimidation; and without recommending any specific course, they wish to call the attention of the House to the frequent perversion of these institutions from their avowed and legitimate objects.

(10.) That the practice of settling disputes by arbitration between masters and workmen has been attended with good effects; and it is desirable that the laws which direct and

regulate arbitration should be consolidated, amended, and made applicable to all trades.

(11.) That it is absolutely necessary, when repealing the combination laws, to enact such a law as may efficiently, and by summary process, punish either workmen or masters who by threat, intimidation, or acts of violence, should interfere with the perfect freedom which ought to be allowed to each party of employing his labour or capital in the manner he may deem most advantageous.

§ 113. The immediate result of this report was the Act of 1824, 5 Geo. IV. c. 95. The following were its chief provisions. The preamble says:

Whereas it is expedient that the laws relative to the combinations of workmen, and to the fixing of the wages of labour, should be repealed, and certain combinations of workmen should be exempted from punishment, and that the attempt to deter workmen from work should be punished in a summary manner, Therefore, etc.

By the first section all the statutes against combinations of workmen are repealed.

By the second section it was enacted:

That journeymen, workmen, or other persons, who should enter into any combination to obtain an advance or to fix the rate of wages, or to lessen or alter the hours or duration of time of working, or to decrease the quantity of work, or to induce another to depart from his service before the end of the time or term for which he was hired, or to quit or return his work before the same should be finished, or, not being hired, to refuse to enter into work or employment, or to regulate the mode of carrying on any manufacture, trade, or business, or the management thereof, should not therefore be subject or liable to any indictment or prosecution for conspiracy, or to any other criminal information or punishment whatever under the statute law.

By the third section it was enacted:

That if any person, by violence to the person or property, by threat or by intimidation, should wilfully or maliciously force another to depart from his hiring or work before the end of the time or term for which he is hired, or return his work before

the same should be finished, or damnify, spoil, or destroy any machinery or prevent any person not being hired from accepting any work or employment; or if any person should wilfully or maliciously use or employ violence towards the person or property, threats or intimidation towards another on account of his not complying with, or conforming to, any rules, orders, resolutions, or regulations made to obtain an advance of wages, or to lessen or alter the hours of working, or to decrease the quantity of work, or to regulate the mode of any manufacture, trade, or business, or the management thereof; or if any person by violence, etc., should wilfully or maliciously force any master or mistress, manufacturer, his or her foreman or agent, to make any alterations in their mode of regulating, managing, conducting, or carrying on their manufacture, trade, or business: Every person so offending, or causing, procuring, aiding, abetting, or assisting in such offence, being convicted thereof in manner hereinafter mentioned, should be imprisoned only, or imprisoned and kept to hard labour, for any time not exceeding two calendar months.

§ 114. The language of this statute clearly showed its object and policy. It was the intention of the legislature to relieve workmen from all liability to punishment for merely engaging in peaceful combinations or strikes, such liability having been considered to be the cause of those outrages and violent proceedings which workmen had so often resorted to when disputes arose, either between them and their masters, or between them and their fellow-workmen not in the union. Accordingly, notwithstanding the statement in the preamble, that it was the object of the statute to prevent workmen deterring other workmen from work, they were expressly permitted, by the second section, to enter into combinations to induce others to depart from their service, etc., or to refuse to enter into work, etc. The object of the insertion of this clause must have been to allow workmen to "strike against" other workmen, rather than that they should "deter them from work" by the employment of those other means, to prevent which summary powers of punishment were given to the magistrates by the third section.

§ 115. The legislature having changed its policy, and removed those prohibitions to which associations of workmen had formerly been subjected, strikes on a large scale, and

obstinately conducted, immediately occurred in various parts of the country; the workmen seemed, as it were, to have taken the hint given to them, and to have indulged freely in the exercise of their newly acquired powers. The legislature was seized with a panic, it was terrified at what appeared to be the consequences of its own act; the manufacturers did their best to promote the feeling of uneasiness and terror which had taken possession of the public mind, and hence, in the following year, the subject was again taken into consideration, another committee was appointed, on the motion of Mr. Huskisson, and fresh evidence taken; indeed at first it seemed as if parliament felt almost inclined to go back to the policy of former times, and to re-enact the old combination laws. But it had now become a more difficult matter than before; it was not an easy thing to undo the legislation of the previous year; substantial reasons for such a retrogressive step would have to be given, and these were not forthcoming. Happily towards the end of the session the panic had subsided; the liberal policy of the preceding year survived the trial, and all parties were contented with a reproduction of the statute of that year, with some alterations in its shape and in the language of some of its provisions.

§ 116. Mr. Wallace, who introduced the Bill, thus states in what manner, and to what extent, the statute, 6 Geo. IV. c. 129, was intended to differ in its effect from 5 Geo. IV. c. 95:

> He was no friend to the combination laws; but he wished that the common law as it stood before should be again brought into force; this he believed would be quite sufficient for the purpose. The principle of the Bill now before the House was to make all associations illegal, excepting those for the purpose of settling such amount of wages as would be a fair remuneration for the workmen. He knew it had been objected that this was not enough; but he thought it was safer to point out the description of association that was legal than to specify all which were illegal, in doing which there was great danger either of putting in too much, or of leaving out something which might be necessary. The Bill of last year was the same in principle as this; but it went a little further; and this, he apprehended, was the cause of the inconvenience now universally felt.

§ 117. The preamble to the statute of 1825 is as follows:

(1) Whereas an Act was passed in the last session of Parliament, intituled, etc., by which Act various statutes and parts of statutes relating to combinations among workmen for fixing the wages of labour, and for regulating or controlling the mode of carrying on any manufacture, etc., were repealed, etc.; and whereas the provisions of the said Act have not been found effectual: (2) and whereas such combinations are injurious to trade and commerce, dangerous to the tranquillity of the country, and especially prejudicial to the interests of all who are concerned in them: (3) and whereas it is expedient to make further provision, as well for the security and personal freedom of individual workmen in the disposal of their skill and labour, as for the security of property and persons of masters and employers, and for that purpose to repeal the said Act, and to enact other provisions and regulations in lieu thereof: be it therefore enacted, etc.

By the first section, 5 Geo. IV. c. 95 is repealed.

By the second section is re-enacted that section of the former Act by which all the statutes against combinations of workmen were repealed.

The third, fourth, and fifth sections are as follows:

III. And be it further enacted that from and after the passing of this Act, (1) if any person shall by violence to the person or property, or by threats, or by intimidation, or by molesting, or in any way obstructing another, force or endeavour to force any journeyman, manufacturer, workman, or other person hired or employed in any manufacture, trade, or business, to depart from his hiring, employment, or work, or to return his work before the same shall be finished; or prevent or endeavour to prevent any journeyman, etc., not being hired or employed, from hiring himself to or from accepting work or employment from any person or persons; or (2) if any person shall use or employ violence to the person or property of another, or threats, or intimidation, or shall molest, or in any way obstruct another for the purpose of forcing or inducing such person to belong to any club or association, or to contribute to any common fund, or to pay any fine or penalty, or on account of his not belonging to any particular club or association, or not having contributed, or having refused to contribute to any common fund, or to pay any fine or penalty, or on account of his not having complied, or of his refusing to comply with rules, orders, resolutions, or regulations made to

obtain an advance or to reduce the rate of wages, or to lessen or alter the hours of working, or to decrease or alter the quantity of work, or to regulate the mode of carrying on any manufacture, trade, or business, or the management thereof; or (3) if any person shall by violence to the person or property of another, or by threats or intimidation, or by molesting, or in any way obstructing another, force or endeavour to force any manufacturer or person carrying on any trade or business to make any alteration in his mode of regulating, managing, conducting, or carrying on such manufacture, trade, or business, or to limit the number of his apprentices, or the number and description of his journeymen, workmen, or servants: Every person so offending, or aiding, abetting, or assisting therein, being convicted thereof in manner hereinafter mentioned, shall be imprisoned only, or shall and may be imprisoned, and kept to hard labour, for any time not exceeding three calendar months.

IV. Provided always, and be it enacted that this Act shall not extend to subject any persons to punishment who shall meet together for the sole purpose of consulting upon and determining the rate of wages or prices which the persons present at such meeting, or any of them, shall require or demand for his or their work, or the hours or time for which he or they shall work in any manufacture, trade, or business, or who shall enter into any agreement, verbal or written, amongst themselves for the purpose of fixing the rate of wages or prices which the parties entering into such agreement, or any of them, shall require or demand for his or their work, or the hours of time for which he or they will work in any manufacture, trade, or business, and that persons so meeting for the purposes aforesaid, or entering into any such agreement as aforesaid, shall not be liable to any prosecution or penalty for so doing, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

V. Provided also, and be it further enacted, that this Act shall not extend to subject any persons to punishment who shall meet together for the sole purpose of consulting upon and determining the rate of wages or prices which the persons present at such meeting, or any of them, shall pay to his or their journeymen or workmen for their work, or the hours or time of working in any manufacture, trade, or business, or who shall enter into any agreement, verbal or written, among themselves for the purpose of fixing the rate of wages or prices which the parties entering into such agreement, or any of them, shall pay to his or their journeymen, workmen, or servants for their work, or the hours or time of working in any manufacture, trade, or business; and that persons so meeting for the purposes aforesaid, or

entering into any such agreement as aforesaid, shall not be liable to any prosecution or penalty for so doing, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

By other sections of the statute, one justice of the peace is empowered to exercise the powers of summary jurisdiction given by the Act, other provisions being made as to witnesses, etc.

§ 118. This measure, although deficient in very many respects, received a qualified approval from the workmen, inasmuch as it recognised the right of combination, and it enabled them without secrecy, or dread of the consequences, to associate together for certain specific purposes. The employers, however, were not so well satisfied, for they foresaw that, even under this moderate law, their former power to crush the workmen was gone, or at least that it was so considerably modified that they could no longer exercise it with that tyranny and harshness with which they had heretofore acted. The continuance of this feeling on the part of the manufacturers is evident from the fact that in November, 1830, Lord Melbourne, a few days after he accepted the seals of office, as home secretary, requested Mr. Nassau W. Senior to inquire into the state of combinations and strikes; he obtained the assistance of Mr. Tomlinson, a lawyer; they circulated questions, examined witnesses, and otherwise obtained information, and in 1831 they sent in a report which, however, was never published officially, and it never bore any fruit. That it was adverse to the workmen is beyond a doubt, as may be seen from "the most material portions of" it, prepared for the press by Mr. Senior himself, in 1862, and published in his "Historical and Philosophical Essays" in 1865. The strong prejudices of the author appear in every paragraph of that report; nevertheless, his condemnation of repressive law is explicit and strong, especially against any revival of the common law against combinations.

§ 119. He clearly points out that 6 Geo. IV. c. 129 revived the common law against combinations, with this exception, namely, that it exempts from punishment persons meeting to determine the wages or hours of labour, which the persons actually present at the meeting shall require or give, or the entering into an agreement among themselves for such a purpose. All

other combinations or agreements to the prejudice of third persons were still conspiracies, and, on indictment, punishable, at the discretion of the court, by fine and imprisonment, to which, in the case of an assault in furtherance of a combination to raise wages, the court could, under 9 Geo. IV. c. 31 sec. 25, add hard labour for any term not exceeding two years. All meetings or agreements whatever for the purpose of affecting the wages or hours of work of persons not present at the meeting, or parties to the agreement, were conspiracies. So were all agreements for controlling a master in the management of his business, as regards the persons he employed, or the machinery which he should use. So also were all agreements not to work in company of any given person, or to persuade other persons to leave their employment, or not to engage themselves. In fact, there was scarcely an act performed by any workman, as a member of a trade union, which was not an act of conspiracy and a misdemeanour. In addition to all this the Act of 1825 extended the punishment of the statutory offence from two to three months' imprisonment, and enabled the prosecution to obtain a conviction on the oath of a single witness, and also on proof that the person charged intended to abscond. But it gave to the party convicted the right of appeal to Quarter Sessions, and directed the execution of the judgment to be meanwhile suspended. The value of this concession is much lessened when it is remembered that the Court of Quarter Sessions was usually composed of persons similar to those who were justices of the peace, all of whom were generally in direct antagonism to the claims of the workmen, and consequently not over-merciful in their interpretation of the law. Singularly enough, in the earlier stages of the agitation against the Act, the opposition was more directly antagonistic to the mode of administering the law, than counter to the several enactments in themselves.

§ 120. The first great public protest was made in 1834 when six Dorchester labourers were convicted and sentenced to seven years' transportation, ostensibly for administering unlawful oaths, but really for the "crime of combination." This conviction was so manifestly unjust, and the sentence so out-

rageously cruel, that some of the ablest, certainly the most independent, men of that day condemned both in no measured terms, and they resolutely demanded the remission of the sentence on these six poor men, and their immediate liberation. An immense demonstration took place in the Copenhagen Fields, on Monday, March 21st, 1834, attended, it is said, by about 400,000 persons; and a procession between six and seven miles in length, consisting of nearly 50,000 workmen, proceeded to the official residence of Lord Melbourne for the purpose of presenting a petition with over 266,000 signatures, on behalf of those six convicted peasants. After a good deal of opposition on the part of the Whig ministry of that day, backed as it was by the major portion of the manufacturing classes, and after much delay, the men were "pardoned," and ordered to be liberated. But the whole proceedings in regard thereto were shamefully cruel and even cowardly; the men had been hastened out of the country, and, after they had been quarantined at Sydney for about three weeks, they were literally sold as slaves at £1 a head; and even when they were pardoned, some of them did not hear of their pardon until years afterwards, and these might never have heard of it until the expiration of their sentence, had it not been for the merest accident of one of them falling across an English newspaper in the colony at the governor's own house. Those prosecutions gave an immense impetus to the cause of unionism; meetings were held all over the country, and petitions were presented signed by scores of thousands. An effort was also made to establish a national federation of the whole of the trades, which movement for some time was very successful; a weekly newspaper was even started to promote the scheme, and continued in existence for nearly two years. With the pardon of the men, however, the agitation cooled down. Permanent work had, however, already begun to take the place of mere spasmodic effort; the several trades were busily employed in perfecting the machinery of their organisation, and thenceforward it is not difficult to trace their systematic operations, and discover the permeating influence of their associative strength and power.

§ 121. The continued development of the unions, and the recurrence of strikes at frequent intervals, occasioned still further anxiety to employers; this feeling was intensified by the strikes of the cotton-spinners in Manchester, in 1829, against a reduction in the price list, consequent on the introduction of new machinery, varying from 30 to 83 per cent. deduction on gross wages. After a period of six months, during which time the men suffered great privations, the strike was closed on the masters' terms. In 1836 the Glasgow cotton-spinners struck for an advance of wages of about 16 per cent.; this was granted by all the masters except a wealthy country manufacturer, and it is alleged by the workmen that the other masters compelled them, by threats of a reduction, to strike against this one. They thereupon struck; the strike lasted sixteen weeks; it cost the union over £3,000; and, in the end, the men were unsuccessful. This was followed in April, 1837, by a notice of the masters to withdraw the advance of 16 per cent. given in the previous autumn. The men unfortunately resisted this; after being out about three weeks they offered to return to work at the 16 per cent. reduction; this the masters now refused, and the men held out for thirteen weeks longer; at the end of this term they submitted unconditionally, the result being a reduction—estimated by the operatives at 57 or 58 per cent., by the masters at 59 per cent. on one-half of the number of workmen, and 43 per cent. on the other half. The total cost of this strike was variously stated at from £24,000 to £30,000, or, adding the losses to other workmen who were thrown out of employment, to masters, manufacturers, tradesmen, etc., the amount was estimated at £161,380. The uneasiness resulting from these and other strikes led to a further inquiry. The immediate cause of this fresh inquiry, together with the substance of the evidence, will be understood from the following recital:

§ 122. On the 13th of February, 1838, a select committee was ordered by the House of Commons to be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Act 6 Geo. IV. c. 129 (the Act commonly called Mr. Hume's Act, repealing the Combination Acts), and generally into the constitution, proceedings, and

extent of any trade unions or combinations of workmen, or employers of workmen in the United Kingdom, and to report their observations to the House. The appointment of the committee originated in a discussion in the House of Commons respecting the conviction, on January 11, 1838, of five Glasgow cotton-spinners, for conspiracy and illegal combination, and the sentence of each to seven years' transportation. The committee had power to send for persons, papers, and records. In June, the committee, after having examined several witnesses, reported to the House the minutes of evidence. In July a second report containing further evidence was printed.

§ 123. The sum and substance of the evidence may be stated as follows:

1. In all the trades, except the Dublin shipbuilding trade, the market was greatly overstocked with unskilled labour.

2. This overstock in the cotton-spinning trade was to be attributed to the necessary custom for each spinner to have the assistance of several boys, who thus in course of time themselves became spinners; but in the printing and building trades it was occasioned by the artificial multiplication of apprentices, and importation of country labour with a view to cheapen labour.

3. Some restriction upon the number of apprentices was requisite; but the rules of the unions made for this purpose were vexatious; these rules were in the printing trade strictly enforced against all employers, in the building trades against irregular employers only.

4. The trades of cotton-spinners and printers were expanding, of Dublin builders decreasing, of Dublin shipbuilders almost extinct.

5. Generally, wages were tending downwards, owing to the competition of masters to undersell each other, and the over-supply of labour.

6. The union rules, which were found most inconvenient to masters, and most frequently led to strikes, were as follows:

a. Prohibitions against working with non-unionists.

b. Prohibitions against piece-work.

c. The establishment of a uniform wage.

d. Restrictions upon the number of apprentices.

7. In all the trades, strikes against individual masters were frequent. In the cotton-spinning trade there had been two general strikes against a reduction of wages, consequent upon

the introduction of enlarged machinery—one at Manchester in 1829, the other at Glasgow in 1837 ; in the printing and building trades there had been no general strike since the change of the Irish currency in 1826.

8. The effect of the repeal of the combination laws upon the conduct of strikes had been in general beneficial. In the printing trade there was a little violence ; amongst cotton-spinners some violence, but not much, and that arising chiefly out of collision with the men imported to succeed those on strike—this collision being partly unavoidable from the large number of operatives displaced at the same time, partly engendered by the custom of the union to "picket" the mills with "guards." But in the Dublin Canal trade there existed a complete system of intimidation and oppression by the union ; and in the Dublin building trades outrages were still of constant occurrence against that section of masters who are termed irregular employers.

9. A fortnight's notice on either side, previous to a change in the rate of wages, would be a preventive of strikes.

10. As a class, unionists were pronounced by the majority of masters to be more highly skilled operatives, and more respectable men, than others in the trades.

11. The effect of combination upon wages was variously represented by the masters. In the opinion of all masters (with one exception) in the spinning and printing trades, combination has no effect upon wages ; in the opinion of all masters in the building trade it keeps them up, but whether to a fair or unfair height is a disputed point. Amongst shipbuilders combination, by limiting apprentices and requiring a uniform wage, was said to have raised wages to such an extent as to ruin trade. Unionists as a rule were in the receipt of higher wages than non-unionists. And the wages of cotton-spinners in Glasgow and Manchester, where combinations existed, were higher than the wages of the same trade in Belfast, where there was no combination.

The evidence taken by the committee was reported at length, but they separated without making a report, or any observations of their own on the evidence given before them.

§ 124. From 1834 to 1842 a good deal was done in the way of further organisation ; occasional protests were from time to time made against the administration of the law, but there was no positive demand for its alteration. In the year 1842, and again in 1845, there were numerous strikes, and with

them, almost as a matter of course, there came prosecutions, and also protests against the administration of the law: in almost every case these were directed against the use which was made of the common law of conspiracy, by which the masters endeavoured to reach not only the perpetrators of unlawful acts, but also the committees of the several unions, and in every case to extend the punishment beyond the term of three months, as fixed by the statute law, to two years under the common law.

§ 125. On March 25, 1845, a society was established called the National Association of United Trades: this continued nominally in existence until 1860. From the records of this association we learn that a great deal of discontent was manifested with regard to the law as it then stood, especially in reference to the law of contract between master and servant. In 1847 there was a prosecution for conspiracy, known as Potts *v.* Selsby and others, for combination against apprentices and non-unionists, and for picketing. The irritation and agitation caused by this prosecution had scarcely died away, when another and still more serious one was instituted against twenty-one masons for conspiracy in 1848. At the numerous and largely attended meetings which were held in support of the workmen, the Act of 6 Geo. IV. c. 129 was frequently canvassed, but, singularly enough, even then there was no general condemnation of the Act, the chief complaint was against the machinations which were employed for the purpose of putting down the combinations of the workmen, namely, the common law of conspiracy. This prosecution subsequently fell through, and the men were discharged, but not without incurring heavy costs, and causing a prolonged agitation. Other prosecutions took place during the same year, the most important being that of Drury and others, at Sheffield, in which case the men were sentenced to ten years' transportation, but on its being taken to a superior court, judgment was reversed. The men had, however, been some time in prison, and the unions were mulcted in heavy law costs; on the whole this was perhaps one of the most atrocious labour prosecutions on record, all the circumstances being considered. These and other prosecutions and convictions

produced a good deal of irritation and agitation, and ultimately resulted in making the unions much more numerous and powerful than they had ever been before. The National Association of United Trades became the centre of a great movement; under its auspices a newspaper was started called the *Labour League*; the association proposed to raise the sum of £50,000 to be used as an "Employment Fund," its object being to find the means of employing, in reproductive industry, those of its members and subscribers who were thrown out of work by labour disputes. During 1848–49 the question of "systematic overtime" was constantly debated by the several sections of the engineers' societies; public meetings were held, and ultimately the votes of the branches were taken, when it appeared that there was an astonishing unanimity in favour of its abolition. This movement led in 1850–51 to a complete reorganisation of the different unions in the various branches of the trade, and resulted in a combination of the several independent associations into one consolidated union, henceforth to be called the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

§ 126. About this time there occurred a further series of prosecutions, the most important being the Newton engineers, in 1847, costing £2,596 3*s.* 1*d.*; the razor-grinders of Sheffield, in 1848, costing £1,201 17*s.* 7*d.*; the tin-plate workers of Wolverhampton, 1851, costing £3,855 8*s.* 6*d.*, or a total for the defence of those three cases of £7,653 9*s.* 2*d.* In each of these the common law of conspiracy was used as the instrument of oppression; they were generally characterised by the workmen as persecutions, not prosecutions, and indeed they well deserved that name. These efforts to punish men for doing what the statute law permitted, caused great discontent both with regard to the law and its administration, and a general demand arose for some alteration in the law, with a view to making it more precise and definite, and restricting its applications to such overt acts as came within the statutory enactments.

§ 127. The great strike and lock-out of the engineers in 1852; the Preston strike of cotton operatives in August, 1853, lasting until March, 1854; and the Wolverhampton tin-plate workers' strike, in 1855, brought the whole question of the

relations of employer and employed, and also the general laws affecting workmen, into still greater prominence; these oft-recurring disputes, with their attendant prosecutions and consequent agitations, tended materially to the development of the unions, and to their growth, both in numbers and wealth, and then serious questions began to arise as to the safety of their funds. In 1854, Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, having obtained the appointment of a select committee to consider a Bill which he had prepared on the law relating to friendly societies, held frequent conferences with representatives of the unions, and others, with a view to obtain some protection for the funds of trade societies. The outcome of this action was the 44th clause of the now repealed Friendly Societies' Act of 1855, which gave a fancied security to their funds, by the fact of simply depositing their rules with the registrar of friendly societies, until this delusion was rudely dispelled by the decision of the Lord Chief Justice in 1866, in the case of Hornby *v.* Close. It is a strange fact that Lord Chief Justice Cockburn was the same man, who, as a barrister, had, in 1854, advised as to the clause, and drafted it, and declared it to be ample for the security and protection of the funds of the unions, yet by his judgment in 1866 he allowed a trade society to be plundered, and the plunderer to escape, through the technicalities of the self-same law.

§ 128. In 1856 a select committee was appointed to inquire into matters connected with masters and operatives. In the evidence given before that committee much useful information was given with regard to the constitution and object of trade societies, and the mode of conducting their business, by several of the witnesses. In 1860 another select committee was appointed, having similar objects to the above; this committee took into consideration the best means of settling labour disputes between masters and operatives, by conciliation and arbitration. In addition to the evidence bearing upon the constitution and rules of trade unions, a large amount of information was given with regard to the prosecutions and convictions which had so frequently taken place in the course of trade disputes. These inquiries drew further attention to the subject of the organisations of the workmen, and much light was thrown upon the

several questions raised, by the discussions in public meetings and in the press.

§ 129. The event, however, which above all others drew attention to these disputes, and aroused the direct interest of the public in the whole question, as it affected the workmen on the one hand, and the employers on the other, was the builders' strike and lock-out, in London, in 1859. The meetings of the men, the reports and comments in the entire press of the country, the magnitude of the struggle, and of the interests involved, excited almost universal interest in the movement, every phase of which was discussed with unabated zeal for many months. The prosecution of Perham for picketing, and his conviction and sentence to two months' imprisonment, re-opened the whole subject of the penal laws against workmen when acting in combination, and also their administration in courts of law. From this time the question was never allowed to slumber until the final repeal of those laws in 1875. The agitation for the amendment of the law became organised, it was no longer a merely vague declamation against unjust convictions, but a well-defined demand for a modification of the laws relating to the masters and servants, for the repeal of the last vestige of the old combination laws, and for the abolition of prosecutions for conspiracy arising out of labour disputes.

§ 130. The press, as usual, met these demands by reviving all the old stories about trade union tyranny and oppression; instances of intimidation and outrage were raked up from the blue books of the past; sometimes the picture was coloured by pure inventions for the sake of effect; the unions were denounced as secret societies, whose power was sustained only by the terrorism which they exercised over the minds of the more timid and ignorant of the workmen; the weak and ill-informed believed all these things and many more, and a cry arose that the unions must be stamped out as an incurable and detestable evil. The unionists replied by challenging investigation, while some of their friends combated these wild accusations in the public journals.

§ 131. In 1864 a conference was held in London to discuss the whole statutory law affecting workmen under contract of

service, with a view to its amendment or repeal. In 1865 a select committee was appointed to inquire into the law as regards contracts of service between master and servant, and as to the expediency of amending the same. The committee was reappointed in 1866. A large amount of evidence was taken, from which it appeared that the average number of prosecutions in England and Scotland alone exceeded 11,000 cases annually. The result of the inquiry was the Master and Servants Act, 1867, which practically repealed 20 Geo. II. c. 19, passed in the year 1747; 6 Geo. III. c. 25, passed in the year 1766; and 4 Geo. IV. c. 34, passed in the year 1823. The Act of 1867, however, never became a permanent statute, for it had to be renewed from year to year by the Expiring Laws Continuance Acts, until its final repeal, together with all the previously mentioned Acts, by the Employers and Workmen Act, 1875, the latter being substituted therefor.

§ 132. Another and still more important inquiry was mooted in 1866, having reference to outrages said to have been committed in Sheffield, Nottingham, and Manchester. In 1867 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into these alleged outrages, and also into the organisation, rules, operations, and conduct of trade societies, and the laws under which they were governed. The investigation was searching and complete; the result is embodied in sixteen volumes of reports; the ordeal was a severe one, but the unions, as a whole, came out of it without a stain.

§ 133. Instead of a law to suppress the unions, as many had hoped, the inquiry into their organisation and rules eventuated first of all in a Temporary Act, protecting their funds, in 1869, and then in the Trade Union Act, 1871, which sanctioned their objects, and legalised their action. The extraordinary activity of the unions during the past twenty-five years has had the effect of extending their influence, consolidating their power, perfecting their organisation, increasing their numbers, and augmenting their wealth, to a degree which is surprising even to their friends, and must be astounding to their opponents. And, withal, it means a stricter discipline, if there be more centralisation and concentration; with a sense of power, there is also a

growing feeling of responsibility; the educational influence alone has been vastly beneficial in its effects, and widespread in its operation. Some details with regard to their development in later years are given in other chapters of this work; these need not be here recapitulated, suffice it to say, that after the passing of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, the agitation for the total repeal of all the penal laws affecting labour became more and more intensified and persistent; the action for securing this end was constitutional and methodical; the public mind was educated by meetings, lectures, publications, annual congresses, deputations to ministers, and interviews with members of Parliament, and by debates, bills, and petitions, until at last a Conservative Government, in 1875, after a slight show of resistance, with the excuse and help afforded by the report of another Royal Commission, granted the workmen's demands.

§ 134. The history of the struggles to secure this great victory is not so well known as it might and should be; it conveys an object lesson replete with interest to workmen, employers, the legislature, and the general public; above all, it ought to teach the law-makers that repressive laws are ineffectual, as well as dangerous and oppressive; that their effect is demoralising on the mind; and that men's ideas of right and wrong become confounded, until a sense of injustice brings about the worst evils of violence, even to ferocity. "Men who know that they are criminals, by the mere reason of the object which they have in view, care little for the additional criminality involved in the means they adopt." The value of the lesson to workmen is not a whit less important than to others; if they study the labour question aright, they will perceive and understand the wisdom of moderation in all their demands; that the duty which they owe to the State, of which they are component members, is to pursue their objects peaceably, and in a constitutional manner; and furthermore, that sooner or later, if the claims put forward are reasonable and just, they will be granted by the legislature. With their present political power, if it be wisely used and directed, no demand, if based on justice, can long be refused; but those who denounce the injustice of others,

must be careful not to incur a like condemnation, by reason of their own departure from the principles of equity. Moreover, in this case, as indeed it might be said to be in all cases, it is politic to be just. Retribution, in some form or another, is sure to follow any departure from the principles of truth and justice; sometimes it is swift and sudden, at other times slow and deferred, but it is certain, sure, and inevitable.

CHAPTER III.

THE OBJECTS, AIMS, CONSTITUTION, AND GOVERNMENT OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. In their essence, trade unions are voluntary associations of workmen for mutual protection and assistance in securing generally the most favourable conditions of labour. This is their primary and fundamental object, and includes all efforts to raise wages or prevent a reduction in wages; to diminish the hours of labour or resist attempts to increase the working hours; and to regulate all matters pertaining to methods of employment or discharge, and modes of working. They have other aims also, some of them not less important than those embraced in the foregoing definition. The sphere of their action extends to almost every detail connected with the labour of the workman, and the well-being of his every-day life. Many of the objects were at one time known under the legal definition of being in restraint of trade, a doctrine rendered obsolete under the legislation embodied in the "Labour Laws," 1875. That some of the aims of trade unions in days gone by were quite within this description can scarcely be denied; that there is a remnant of the old spirit still left in some of the unions cannot be gainsaid, but in general the description does not now apply, in the sense in which the expression was formerly used.

§ 2. The legislature, as shown in the preceding chapter, was slow to recognise the right of workmen to combine; and even after the nominal right was conceded, the means by which they endeavoured to carry out their objects were condemned as being unlawful. Both the objects and the means are now lawful, so

long as the members of the unions do not attempt to interfere with the personal freedom of others to make for themselves what terms they please in the disposal of their labour.

§ 3. The first essential principle of the existence of a trade union is that it shall be purely voluntary—upon no other basis could it legally or possibly exist. A man must have perfect liberty either to join or refrain from joining such society, according to his taste or inclination, and no justification can be offered for any attempt to violate this first condition of membership. Instances frequently occur in which a certain amount of social pressure is used in order to bring men into the union, but they are rather exceptional; and usually they are not effective, for workmen like others resent any kind of personal dictation, and if they do yield to its influence it is only for a time, until an opportunity for repudiation occurs.* Coercion is not only a violation of law, but it is also contrary to morals; the law is jealous of any interference with the personal liberty of the subject, and rightly so, for absolute freedom is the right of every citizen in a free State. It is equally wrong for an employer to attempt to interfere with the freedom of the workmen, with the intention of preventing them from joining a union if they think fit to do so. Neither the employer nor the workman has the right to fetter the free action of any other person in this matter, or to force him to do, or abstain from doing, that which he thinks best for himself.

§ 4. That which is now conceded by law as a right, should not be interfered with under any pretence whatever. As a matter of personal freedom, it is of the utmost importance that this voluntary principle should be maintained in its entirety and fulness, for it forms the basis of our political liberties, it is guaranteed to us by the Constitution, it has been won for us by the blood, and treasure, and suffering of our forefathers, and this freedom should be especially dear to all trade union workmen, in consequence of their own struggles to secure the right of

* Recent events in connection with some of the labourers' strikes, would seem to justify a modification of the first part of this sentence, and to confirm the last portion of it. But, as compared with the past, the general statement in the text is not invalidated.

combination. The sacredness of personal freedom should therefore be held intact, and defended at all hazards, for it is consecrated by the past efforts of those who fought our battles and won our victories. The violation of this principle will but endanger the common cause of liberty, and jeopardise the very existence of trade unions.

§ 5. It must be conceded that each man has a perfect right for himself to fix the price at which he will give his labour, or to refuse to work if the terms offered do not suit him; so equally has another man the right to accept or refuse, either the work or the terms, without molestation from his fellow-workmen, or from the employer; and that which one has a right to do singly, two or more have a right to do in agreement, so long as they, both individually and in combination, do not interfere by unlawful means with the free action of a third party, to refuse or accept the proffered terms.

§ 6. An employer has an equal right to say to the workman, "I will only give a certain price, or employ you on specified conditions; if you don't like it you can go elsewhere." A good deal depends in all cases upon the manner in which these things are said and done; the right, however, remains in theory and in fact.

§ 7. But an individual workman has little chance of obtaining what he deems "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work," or other equitable conditions of labour. His necessities often compel him to accept terms which he feels to be inadequate, and even unjust; but the question with him is, how to enforce the higher wages, or exact better terms. It is true that he wants work, it is equally true that the employer wants his labour, but the latter can afford to wait until another man, more needy than the first, applies for employment, when perhaps the employer will be able to obtain the services of the last comer on the terms which the first man refused. In any case, he can but wait and see, and if he cannot then procure workmen on the terms which he has fixed, there is no great harm done; he can only as a last resort agree to give the higher price and secure their labour. With the journeyman it is altogether different; he cannot wait, his means are quickly exhausted,

and hunger frequently compels him to accept any terms that may be offered.

§ 8. But if the workmen who are thus seeking employment have mutually agreed not to accept work below a stated price, or only upon specified conditions, and they have, with others, provided a fund which will enable them to withhold their labour until a better price is offered, they are justified in so doing, and they have by this arrangement placed themselves upon something like an equality with the employer, because they have at command similar means of waiting, and of bidding for better terms. So also the masters have a perfect right to combine in the same way for like purposes, and to assure each other against heavy losses in case of any refusal to accept employment on the part of the workmen, as a result of previously concerted action and organisation. It therefore comes to this—that both parties have an equal right of accepting or refusing each other's terms, and this right they can exercise either singly or in combination.

§ 9. It is perhaps scarcely necessary now to enter into any elaborate argument in defence of this right of combination, seeing that it is fully conceded by law, and is admitted by every one whose opinion is worth considering. There are still, however, very many persons, some of whom sit in high places, who assume the right of declaring, in an *ad captandum* sort of way, that these combinations are questionable, both as to their objects, and the means used for attaining them, and they think it doubtful whether trade unions ought to be allowed by law to exist at all. Some such obsolete statements and arguments appear from time to time, and exercise an influence on the minds of weak people, who are unable to grasp the subject for themselves.

§ 10. Really the only question which can now remain open for discussion is as to whether the objects which any particular combination may have in view, or the means by which it may attempt to enforce them, are, or are not, lawful. Many of the evils which in the past arose out of combinations of workmen were due to the unwise attempts of the legislature to interfere with a just and natural right. The policy which prompted such legislative interference was precisely the same

as that which led the infuriated workmen to destroy machinery, to burn ricks, to resort to rattening and personal violence, and was equally opposed to the true interests of trade, personal freedom, constitutional liberty, and to the welfare of all parties in the State, whether employers, workmen, or the body politic. It was a mistaken policy which only did harm, and could serve no good or useful purpose.

§ 11. Few writers have better illustrated the value of combination, and its legitimate sphere of action, than the Duke of Argyll in his book entitled "The Reign of Law," a few extracts from which may here be given. He says: "It is often said that the conduct and condition of men are governed by invariable laws; and the conclusion is that the evils which arise by way of natural consequence out of the action of those laws are evils against which the struggles of the will are hopeless. But the facts on which this conclusion is founded are, as usual, inaccurately stated." "The conduct of men depends on the balance of motives which are brought to bear upon them. In supplying these motives external conditions and mental character act and react upon each other." "The external conditions which tell on the individual will are themselves very often nothing but conditions depending on the aggregate will of those around us; and if upon them, by any means, new motives can be brought to bear, then the whole of those external conditions may be changed." "New motives can be evoked and put in action by the adapting of appropriate means. The mere founding, for example, of a voluntary society for any given purpose evolves out of the primary elements of human character a latent force of the most powerful kind—namely, the motive, the sentiment, the feeling, the passion, as it often is, of the spirit of association." "It is a force rooted in the nature of man, implanted there as a part of its constitution, and like all others of this character, given him for a purpose, and having its own legitimate field of operation. Nor is that field a narrow one. The spirit of association is the fountain of much that is noblest in human character, and of much which is most heroic in human conduct." "And so it is that when the aim of any given association is a high

aim, directed to ends really good, and seeking the attainment of them by just methods of procedure, the spirit it evokes becomes itself a new 'law,' a special force operating powerfully for good on the mind of every individual subject to its influence. Some pre-existing motives it modifies, some it neutralises, some it suppresses altogether, some it compels to look in new directions. But in all cases the spirit of association is in itself a power, a force, a law in the realm of mind. What it can do, and what it cannot do, in affecting the conditions of society is a problem not to be solved so easily and so summarily as some dogmatists in political philosophy would have us believe. It is a question which, like so many others, is not likely to be solved by abstract reasoning without the help of actual experiment. And this experiment is being tried. The instincts of men, truer often than the conclusions of philosophy, have rebelled against the doctrine that they are the sport of circumstances; yet, finding by hard experience that this is often true of the individual will when standing by itself, they have resolved to try whether it is equally true of the collective will, guided by the spirit and strengthened under the discipline of association. Hence the phenomena of combination as a means of affecting the condition of labour—phenomena so alarming to many minds, and certainly so well deserving of attention."

§ 12. The principle upon which the associations called Trade Unions are founded is that of a mutual assurance society, the object being to enable the members to do by combination that without which they would otherwise be unable to do. They seek to accomplish this by means of contributions, each member of the union paying a definite weekly sum, which entitles him to all the benefits set forth in the society's rules. The amounts vary, according to the society, from twopence per week in some of the poorer trades to one shilling per week in the Engineers', Boiler-makers' and Iron-shipbuilders', Ironfounders', Carpenters', and other similar unions. It is seldom that there are two scales of payment in any one union, for all members pay alike, and are equally entitled to all the benefits which the rules of the society provide. There are, however, some few societies which keep their

trade funds and benefit funds separate and distinct; in these a member may pay to the trade fund only, if he thinks proper to do so. When this is done it is usually by those members who, before joining the trade union, had become members of some other and independent friendly society.

§ 13. A large number of trade unions, however, still exist for trade purposes only, excepting the burial fund, which is well-nigh universal—it is, in fact, a remnant of the very earliest form of association known, having been one of the objects of the early English guilds. There is a general tendency among the modern trade unions to embrace in their objects both trade and friendly benefits, thereby securing to their members all the advantages offered by the ordinary friendly society, in addition to those which the trade society provides for the protection of "trade interests." It is a gratifying fact that in all cases these unions fulfil their pecuniary obligations to their members, monetary failures being almost altogether unknown.

§ 14. The annexed table is designed to show the contributions and benefits of a few of the largest and best organised trade unions; these are, however, but samples of societies existing all over the kingdom. (See next page.) In the Iron-founders' Society the strike pay of members ceases at the end of six weeks, but the extra amount is continued to the wife and children for eight weeks longer, during which the men only receive the usual pay accorded to out-of-work members, on donation benefit.

§ 15. One of the most important and effective means which the better organised modern trade unions have adopted for the purpose of exerting an indirect influence on the "labour market," and preventing a reduction of wages, is donation benefit, from the "out-of-work fund," by which each member is entitled to a certain specified sum per week during the time he is out of work through depression in trade or loss of employment, from any one of the many causes which are constantly in operation, and which affect more or less seriously most of the ordinary occupations in which the mechanics and artisans belonging to the unions are engaged. Employment in many trades is extremely precarious, the hiring of the work-

Examples of Weekly Contributions and Benefits in some of the chief Trade Unions.

Name of Society.	Weekly Contributions.	Weekly Sick Benefit.	Sums payable at Death.		Compensation for Injury—Disablement.	Weekly Superannuation Benefit.	Weekly Out-of-work Benefit.	Emigration, or loss of Tools. Total Amount.	Weekly Strike Benefit.
			Member.	Member's Wife.					
Engineers ...	1/-	10/- 26 weeks, after which 5/-	£12	£5	£50 to £100	10/- to 7/- per week	10/- 14 weeks 7/- 26 ditto 6/- after	£10, tools	10/- and 5/- by levy.
Steam-engine-makers ...	1/-	10/-	£12	£6	£50 to £100	10/- per week to 6/- ditto	10/-, per week	£5, tools	10/- and 5/- by levy.
Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders	1/-	10/- 26 weeks 5/- ditto 4/- after	£12	£6	£100	7/- per week to 4/- ditto	11/- down to 4/- per week	Emigration Abatement of benefits.	12/- per week, or 10/- ditto.
Ironfounders	1/-	9/- 13 weeks 8/- ditto 6/- 26 weeks	£10	£5	£100	7/6 to 5/- per week	9/- to 6/- per week	Benevolent Grants, since 1873.	11/-, extra for wife and child.
Carpenters and Joiners	1/-	12/- 26 weeks 6/- afterwards so long as ill	£12	£5	£100 to £50	8/- to 7/- per week	10/- 12 weeks 6/- 12 weeks	Unemployed benefit.	15/- to 7/6 per week.
Stonemasons	6½d. to 1/0½	10/- 13 weeks 5/- ditto	£10; or Accidental death, £50	£6	£100	5/- to 4/- per week	Travelling relief 9/-	Lower contributions.	12/- per week to 21/-.
Bricklayers ...	7d. to 9d.	15/- 13 weeks 9/- ditto 5/- ditto	£10	£5	£50	9/- to 5/- per week	Travelling benefit 9/-	Nil.	15/- per week to full wages.
Plasterers ...	6d.	10/-	£10	£6	£50	5/- per week	Travelling 9/-	Nil.	15/-
Tailors	7d.	10/- to 7/-	£6	£4	Nil.	5/- to 2/6 per week	Travelling relief 9/4	Nil.	15/-
Compositors, London ...	8d.	Nil.	£15	£5	Nil.	8/- to 4/- per week	12/-	£10	25/-
Typographical Association	5d.	Nil.	£10	Nil.	Nil.	8/- to 6/- per week	8/-	Nil.	20/-

Note.—In addition to the foregoing benefits, many Unions have a Benevolent Fund for the relief of distressed members, and some afford medical relief.

man not being for a definite period, or even for the "job," or contract, upon which he is set to work. Many circumstances may arise to cause a temporary cessation of the work, in which case the pay ceases also—and this stoppage may last for days or weeks—hence this particular "benefit" confers a permanent and unique advantage upon the members of trade unions; it is a kind of mutual assurance fund, which to some extent helps to equalise wages, and at the same time prevents members from being reduced to the necessity of accepting work upon inadequate terms, or when attempts are made to lower wages, or enforce conditions disadvantageous to the workmen.

§ 16. If, however, a man is discharged for drunkenness, or for any actual misconduct on his part, he is not entitled to participate in this "benefit"; and it is of little use for him to attempt to plead some idle excuse to the society's officials, or give any reason for his discharge other than the real one, inasmuch as the men who were employed by the master or firm will know the precise cause for such discharge. As each member of the society considers himself to be a kind of guardian of the common purse, in the shape of the society's funds, a wholesome restraint is imposed on every member, which produces a salutary effect on his conduct, and tends to prevent any attempt at fraud. Moreover, each member feels it to be his bounden duty to "look out" for work for those who are unemployed, and consequently on the funds, so as to relieve the society from the demand thus made upon it, at the earliest possible moment, and thereby minimise the expenditure; at the same time it conduces to greater regularity of employment for those who are members of the union.

§ 17. This fraternal consideration for each other, whether it be the result of pure good-fellowship, or of a selfish wish to preserve, as far as possible, all the good things for those only who are in the same union, and thereby ultimately react for the benefit of each and every member of it, is useful and beneficial in many ways; in either case it tends to improve the condition of those who for the time being are the recipients of benefits conferred, arising from whatever combination of circumstances. If a justification were needed for acting upon the

principle of aiding those who are co-members of the same association, it will be found in the conduct and mode of procedure of every society established on the mutual principle, whether commercial or philanthropic; but perhaps the best example that can be quoted is that of the Freemasons, whose care for each other is proverbial, and whose generosity in case of need is all the more remarkable, because of its voluntary character.

§ 18. One of the most obvious benefits which accrue to the public and to the nation at large, is this: that members of a trade union having an "out-of-work fund," are, when thrown out of employment, maintained out of funds subscribed when the members are in work; they are thus prevented from becoming a burden on the rates. Thousands of families yearly are by these means kept from the degradation of pauperism; they pay the poor-rate, and in addition thereto they insure themselves against the necessity of being the recipients of that for which the poor-rate is supposed to be collected. It is, of course, the duty of every man thus to provide for the future as far as he is able to do so, and this is the trade union workman's method of self-help. The extent to which this provision is made, and the amounts paid annually in the relief of out-of-work members, will astonish many who entertain the absurd idea that trade unions are established only for the purpose of strikes. The following statistics will show that they have nobler objects and higher aims.

§ 19. The following table reproduces and extends the figures for 1875 and 1876 respectively, given in the previous issue of this work, as regards payments to members out of work, and it further gives the corresponding amounts paid in 1888 and 1889—the last two years—and also summaries for the purposes of comparison:

Years.	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.	Ironfounders' Society.	Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders.	Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners.	London Society of Compositors.
	£	£	£	£	£
1875	31,560	11,186	16,365	2,658	848
1876	45,036	17,689	20,776	2,963	2,226
1888	54,740	12,629	7,151	30,105	5,544
1889	29,733	5,811	3,486	18,805	5,188

The extent of this provision for members out of work will be best seen by the following summaries, of ten years each:

	£	£	£	£	£
1867–76	356,894	160,881	61,000	51,458	19,920
1877–86	667,817	224,491	321,299	213,437	44,773

The following general summary gives the aggregate amounts up to the date previously given, and also the total amounts to the present time, showing how continuously this fund is operative in these societies:

Engineers.	Ironfounders.	Boiler-makers.	Carpenters.	Compositors.
26 years— 1851 to 1876.	29 years— 1848 to 1876.	10 years— 1867 to 1876.	17 years— 1860 to 1876.	29 years— 1848 to 1876.
£659,516	£365,313	£61,000	£54,325	£29,570
39 years— 1851 to 1890.	42 years— 1848 to 1890.	23 years— 1867 to 1890.	30 years— 1860 to 1890.	42 years— 1848 to 1890.
£1,492,264	£709,560	£308,507	£349,495	£89,820

Arranged in another form, in order to bring out more clearly the aggregate totals paid in support of out-of-work members, the above figures show that, in the two decades mentioned, these five societies alone distributed, in this benefit, the following amounts:

	1867 to 1876.	1877 to 1886.
	£	£
Amalgamated Society of Engineers ...	356,894	667,817
Friendly Society of Ironfounders... ...	160,881	224,491
Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders ...	61,000	321,299
Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners ...	51,458	213,437
London Society of Compositors	19,920	44,773
Totals ...	£650,152	£1,471,817

The preceding figures show the expenditure of no less a sum than £2,121,962 in twenty years—1867 to 1886 inclusive—in support of those out of employment, quite irrespective of other benefits, such as sick, funeral, superannuation, accidents, etc.,

correspondingly paid away during those years. How much distress has been thus averted, how much suffering alleviated, and how many have been kept from applying for pauper relief, it is impossible to say. But that the whole of the expenditure has been well and beneficially employed no one with a grain of common sense can gainsay. It is a matter of regret that some of the so-called "new trade unionists" sneer at benefits such as these. Whether such sneers arise from ignorance, inexperience, or the vain desire to glorify themselves, and magnify their own importance, by decrying the self-denying efforts of the old leaders, and original founders of the modern form of trade unions, they are equally to be deprecated. In view of these recent attacks upon the Friendly Society objects of trade unions, the figures before tabulated may be usefully summarised in still another form, in order to show the aggregate payments in "donation benefit" to out-of-work members, over the whole series of years during which it has been in operation, thus:

	Years.	Aggregate Totals.
		£
Amalgamated Society of Engineers	39	1,492,264
Friendly Society of Ironfounders	59	709,560
Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders	23	308,507
Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners ...	30	349,495
London Society of Compositors	42	89,820
Total expenditure in "donation benefit" to out-of-work members		£2,949,646

§ 20. In consequence of this reserve fund to fall back upon, and all the other forces that are behind it, the workman is no longer compelled to accept any terms which an employer may offer, especially when that offer means reduced pay, or longer hours of labour; for the capital thus subscribed is for the purpose of sustaining him until trade improves, and he is able to command the current wages of the district. At the same time, a member must not refuse work, or the terms offered, if they are fair and reasonable, and in accordance with the usages of the locality; or, if he does, he will forfeit all claim on the funds, for these are not subscribed for the purpose of supporting

idlers in idleness, but in order to sustain those who, through no fault of their own, are thrown out of employment until they can again obtain work, either in the same firm, or elsewhere.

§ 21. This "out-of-work fund" or "donation" benefit, as it is called by most societies, is quite distinct and separate from strike pay, although many ill-informed writers manage to jumble both together as though the one was merely a cloak for the other. This is not so, and never has been the case in any trade union, even when strikes were most denounced, and were scarcely within the four corners of the law—under the now exploded doctrine of being in restraint of trade—and when, therefore, some excuse existed for concealment. During the time when such societies sought protection for their funds by depositing their rules with the Registrar of Friendly Societies, they were careful not to express in definite terms any object in the rules which might be construed as being in restraint of trade. Singularly enough, some twenty years ago, under the Trade Union Act, 1871, the legislature went to the opposite extreme, and enacted that the society must have been unlawful but for the passing of the Act "by reason of some one or more of its purposes being in restraint of trade." This imposed on the society, as a condition of registration, that it should be in contravention of the existing common or statute law, and made the legal existence of the society entirely dependent upon the Trade Union Act, 1871. This anomaly was only removed by the Trade Union Act Amendment Act, 1876, which provides that a society may be registered as a trade union "whether such combination *would or would not*, if the principal Act had not been passed, have been deemed to have been an unlawful combination by reason of some one or more of its purposes being in restraint of trade." The absurdity of the law, as it existed prior to 1876 can scarcely be paralleled in the whole history of the statute law of England, stupid as many of its enactments have been ; and it is here only pointed out as showing how ill-understood were these organisations of the workmen, and what prejudices existed in the public mind against every kind of combination which had for its object the regulation of labour and of the relations subsisting between em-

ployers and workmen. The amendment of the law by the Act of 1876 and the enlargement thereunder of the definition of a trade union, cannot but be beneficial in their results, both as regards the unions, and the public. Every motive for concealment is now abolished, and the way is paved for the registration of every trade society in the kingdom, whether they contemplate using their funds for strike purposes or not, thus constituting them public bodies, whose rules and mode of management are open to inspection, and whose members are amenable to the law, in precisely the same manner and to the same extent as those of other legally constituted corporate associations.

§ 22. In addition to the extremely useful and legitimate provisions for supporting their members when out of work, there is in most societies an allowance to members on going from home in search of employment: this is called travelling relief. At one time tramping was systematic and general; and it became a great nuisance, for many men merely used the society as a means for enabling them to tramp all over the country, living upon the funds of the union, supplemented usually by collections from workmen in the several towns and villages through which they passed. This practice has greatly diminished of late years; if properly used, the system of tramp relief might have been good and useful, but in the past it so degenerated as to become little better than a kind of professional mendicity, excepting that the mendicants begged from those least able to afford assistance, and urged their claims for contributions with a pertinacity and kind of authority, as to assume that it was a right to which they were justly entitled, and ought not to be refused. The method of relieving those on tramp was pretty much the same in all societies, although the amounts granted slightly differed, and the distances to be travelled before relief could be obtained was greater or less according to the trade, and to the next "relieving station," that is the lodge, on the route taken by the "journeyman" member. Bed and breakfast are generally provided, but this is not a universal rule, in addition to which the member gets a shilling or eighteen-pence towards his maintenance until he reaches the next relieving station. These vary in distance from each other;

they may be sixteen or they may be twenty-five miles apart, but on the average the amount paid is about one penny per mile. In some societies it is usual to pay the railway fares, third class, to some distant place in search of employment: this mode of relief has been in operation for some time in the Amalgamated Carpenters' and Joiners' Society, and it is stated that it has had the effect of greatly diminishing the system of tramping from place to place. The custom of tramping from one town to another is a very old one; it existed under the old guilds, and was general all through Germany until very recent times; it is still practised there to a much greater extent than it is in England. The origin of the term journeyman may be traced to this ancient custom, one of the objects of which, in olden times, was to acquire experience in the craft or mystery in which the traveller was engaged, by seeing the different methods of work in various parts of the country.*

§ 23. Strike pay differs materially from the foregoing benefits, and distinguishes the trade union from all other working class associations; it was precisely this one feature which aroused all the antagonism of capitalists and opposition of jurists to its recognition as a legitimate object of association, and for generations stamped the trade union as a "combination," rather than as an "association," for while the purposes of the latter were regarded as lawful, those of the former were considered to be illegal, the supreme distinction between the two being vaguely defined as "restrictions in restraint of trade." This avowed object of trade unions was so repugnant to the legislature, and to courts of law, that, after the object itself was declared to be legal, the means by which it was sought to be effected were still declared illegal, and consequently these unions were hampered in their free action, and their members were imprisoned for simply doing that which under any other

* Since the above was written, in 1877, the system of travelling relief has declined more and more. It is discouraged by nearly all the better organised unions throughout the country, and, as a rule, rightly so. In the London Society of Compositors and the Scottish Typographical Association travelling relief has been abolished for several years, the members receiving a removal grant to enable them to proceed to an engagement they may have obtained in any part of the United Kingdom.

circumstances would have been perfectly lawful, and therefore legitimate, under the common and statute law. Both the object and the means are now lawful, unless they constitute "a combination to commit a crime, whether that crime be the object or the means of the combination." The distinction is a vast one, and makes all the difference between a legal association or corporate body, and one that is illegal. The Acts of 1875 abolished the last vestige of the old combination laws directed against labour, and labourers as such, and placed all such associations on a footing of equality.

§ 24. Members of a trade union are only allowed strike pay when they are "called out" by order of the society, or when they leave work in accordance with specified rules, in the event of an employer attempting to enforce regulations other than those under which they had been working, and contrary to the expressed or implied conditions upon which they undertook the work. In the latter case the executive of the union have first to be satisfied that the strike was reasonable in itself, that it was within the scope of the society's rules, and that it was justifiable, under the circumstances, to cease work. But even in such a case it is generally incumbent on the part of the men to inform the chief officer of the union of the cause of such dispute, and then it becomes his duty to try and settle it without a strike. Sometimes the men strike first and reason afterwards; but this is a violation of the spirit of the rules of every well-regulated trade union, even when it is not absolutely contrary to the expressed provisions of such rules; and such action is generally condemned as hasty and ill-advised, while sometimes strike pay is resolutely refused.

§ 25. In most cases a vote of the entire body has to be taken before a strike can take place; so that it is neither the act of the leaders, the officers, the executive committee, a clique, a mere section of the members, or of all combined, but the deliberate decision of the whole body of the members composing the union, in all parts of the country, by their recorded vote. When a strike has been thus sanctioned, strike pay is allowed according to a scale provided in the society's rules. The following are the weekly payments given by some societies to

those on strike: Engineers, 10*s.*; Ironfounders, 11*s.* and 2*s.* for the wife, with 1*s.* 6*d.* for each child; Carpenters, 15*s.*; Masons, 12*s.*; Bricklayers, 10*s.*; Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, 11*s.*; Plasterers, 15*s.*; Compositors, 25*s.* These amounts are frequently supplemented by additional payments from levies, from the contingent fund, or from contributions in aid, given by other societies; in which case those on strike are paid *pro ratâ*, according to their family, that is, so much for the wife and each child, and equally in so far as the strikers are concerned.

§ 26. The usual method of procedure, with a view to obtain an advance of wages, a reduction of the working hours, or any other special benefit sought by the members of a given union, or branch of a union, the refusal of which by the employers may lead to a strike, is as follows. The movement originates with the workmen in some particular shop, firm, or place; the proposal has then to be submitted to the local branch or lodge, where it is discussed in all its bearings; if the motion be carried by the members of the local branch, it has to be sent to the executive of the union, with full particulars as to the privilege sought to be obtained, and the nature of the proposed change, together with a statement as to the state of trade in the district, the number of employers likely to be affected by the dispute, the number of men in the union, and of non-unionist workmen, the number of votes recorded by the branch for and against the motion, and as to the probability of success, if the demand be made. This formulated statement is then discussed by the cool-headed men forming the executive committee, most of whom may not be directly affected by the result, although deeply interested in the success or non-success of the proposed change. If, after discussion, the executive agree to the proposal, this full statement of particulars, with such comments as they may deem expedient, is sent to every lodge belonging to the union, by whom also the proposition has to be considered and discussed; the votes of the whole of the members are then taken, *pro* and *con.*, and the proposal is either sanctioned, or refused, according to the majority of the votes given. All this is done in such a way that no undue influence or pressure can be brought to bear on any individual voter; for the voting

paper is either sent direct to the member's residence and he has to return it by a given night, which is clearly stated on the paper, or it is distributed on the night of the meeting specially summoned for the purpose, and he can vote for or against the proposition according to his own conviction. There is no canvassing, no influence by agitators, paid or otherwise, no pressure by officials; everything is done in a purely democratic manner, free from coercive influences, each member having an equal right by voice and vote in the ultimate decision. All this preliminary work has to be done before any decisive step can be taken, by the men who are desirous of entering into a strike, for some real or supposed personal or local advantages. It is obvious that if any one town or district makes a proposal which other towns think preposterous or unreasonable, the requisite authority will not be given. For instance, if London workmen, in any particular trade, were seeking an advance in wages of 6*d.* per day, or a reduction in the working hours of one hour per day, the question would have to be referred to, and be practically decided by, the workmen in other towns who were then probably working longer hours, at a lower rate of wages than the London men, and who, therefore, might consider themselves underpaid and overworked, as compared with the men who were seeking the special privilege contained in the schedule, upon which the vote was being taken. Under these circumstances they would not hastily or readily give their sanction to the proposed change, which would not materially benefit them, and for which they would probably have to be heavily taxed, in order to pay the necessary expenses of the contest. There is, therefore, a wholesome check upon the members generally, which would deter them from making any very extravagant demands, inasmuch as the men in an ill-paid district would withhold their sanction, unless they were satisfied that the proposed change was reasonable and just. If the majority of the members refused their sanction, the strike would be prevented, or at least it would be deferred until the next year. Many such applications are refused every year; in other cases the demands are modified so as to prevent, if possible, a contest or open rupture with the employers. There are instances where

the local branch of a union has engaged in a strike when the general body has refused its sanction; but if it does so act, the entire cost has to be defrayed by local levy and not from the general funds.

§ 27. In some societies the local branch has to obtain the particular privilege sought, and maintain it intact for at least twelve months, before it can command the support of the entire body; when this has been done, its future maintenance is guaranteed by the whole force and funds of the society. It is evident, therefore, that the tendency to strike is greater in merely local, than in general or amalgamated societies, and that these disputes occur in an inverse ratio to the completeness of the organisation; for in proportion as a trade is well organised, so there will be provided suitable checks, which will have the effect of preventing hasty and ill-considered measures, which can only end in disaster and ruin to men and masters. If we examine into the history of strikes during the past thirty years, we shall find that they have been more numerous, reckless, blundering, foolish, and mischievous in their results, in the newly formed and badly constituted unions, than they have been in those long established, wealthy, and well governed, with branches all over the country.* In the latter, the struggle may be more prolonged and obstinate, but it will be less turbulent and hasty, for organisation will control lawlessness, and take the place of mere brute force.

§ 28. The aggregate amount expended in support of "trade privileges" is not so large as is generally supposed—in some societies it forms an inconsiderable item in the accounts, in others it is rather high, but in all it varies in amount from year to year, according to circumstances, and the state of the "labour market." If disputes are frequent and obstinate they are necessarily costly, but in many trades they are infrequent, and occur only at long intervals. In some trades, however, strikes are chronic, scarcely a week passing without some dispute or other in connection with one or more of their branches. But

* This passage has acquired additional force from the history of the last two years, during which such strikes have been frequent, and have fulfilled all the conditions described.

the fault does not always lie with the union, as many people imagine; the employers are quite as often in fault as the workmen. Some masters are what are called Tartars—they are ever on the alert to take a mean advantage, or interfere with some custom or usage—an attitude which the men quickly resent; others, on the contrary, seldom if ever have a dispute with their work-people; and therefore it is not fair to charge the men or the unions with being the cause of every strike.

§ 29. It is often said that the unions seek to enforce their claims in an arbitrary manner, even when the original object sought is justifiable, or at least excusable. No doubt methods have been, and sometimes still are, adopted which can scarcely be commended, but these are mostly the acts of unruly men, naturally violent in themselves, and who would be even more so were it not for the restraint imposed on them by the union. Whenever arbitrary proceedings are resorted to by the authority of the union, or are connived at by the members generally, they usually occur in connection with societies which are of recent growth, where discipline is not as yet learned or not properly enforced, or, in some few cases, by those old-fashioned unions which have not been able to understand the altered conditions of the times in which they live, the circumstances by which they are surrounded, and the newer and juster laws by which they are governed.

§ 30. In the formation of a union the only thing really required is, for a number of workmen voluntarily and mutually to agree that it is essential for the protection of their interests to have a union, and forthwith they proceed to constitute one. The originators of the movement, having more or less clearly conceived in their own minds the objects which they deem suitable for the special trade or calling to which they belong, and the requirements of the class they represent, and also the payments or contributions which the workmen belonging to the trade are able or willing to pay, and having also decided generally as to the basis upon which the society shall be constituted, canvass their fellow-workmen for the purpose of securing their adhesion to a plan, the outline of which they

have prepared. If the proposal meets with sufficient support, a meeting is called of those who are friendly to the scheme, when the subject is discussed in all its details; if a majority of those present decide in favour of a union, those willing to join give in their names, and pay a small fee towards the preliminary expenses. A provisional committee is then elected to consider the several proposals, to arrange the necessary details, and to draft a code of working rules. It is very seldom, indeed, that the organisation of a trade union is due to the ambition of any particular individual, and it is still more seldom for it to be instituted as a means of finding a "fat place" for some needy adventurer. "Promotion money" is unknown, and very often the original members, in the earlier stages of the movement, have to "go a-begging" for a secretary. There may have been instances, of course, where the formation of the union has been the result, in the first place at least, of the personal ambition of some particular man with a view to his own aggrandisement—it is scarcely in human nature for such motives to be entirely absent—but, as a rule, self-interest as the motive power is of short duration in any of these unions. Other and better men are soon found, whose sole object is the welfare of those for whom they act, and who will subordinate private ends to the public good. The feeling which prompts the formation of the union is spontaneous as well as voluntary; the need usually precedes the act; cause and effect operate in this case with logical sequence and precision.

§ 31. Having resolved to form a trade union, the next thing to be done is to frame a code of working rules for its government. These rules are based on the principle of voluntaryism; there is an absence of the spirit of dictation, for the very essence of such a union is equality, each member having equal rights and equal privileges, no man being greater or less than another, in so far as voting power is concerned. The rules as first agreed on are at all times open to revision, although, to avoid too frequent alterations and unnecessary expense, they are usually not revised under three years, sometimes they are made binding for four, five, or seven years. Each candidate for admission to the society has a copy of the

rules handed to him on being proposed as a member, and on the night of his initiation such portions of the rules as are specially important, are read to him in open lodge. He is then asked whether he knows and understands the rules by which he consents to be governed, and only on his assenting to the rules, so submitted to him, will he be accepted as a member. There are no secret or unwritten laws or bye-laws of any kind; he knows, or should know, in their entirety, the rules and laws of the society of which he desires to be a member, and, when once admitted, he has an equal voice with the rest in determining the nature and character of the rules and bye-laws for the government of the union.

§ 32. It is thought by many that, in most of the unions, there are bye-laws, which are more stringent and objectionable than the general laws of the association; that these are of a secret character, on account of being more repugnant to public policy; and that they contain matters which the unions dare not embody in their published rules. This is altogether a mistake; the idea originated in an unreasonable prejudice against the unions on the part of their opponents, some of whom believed that such obnoxious rules must necessarily exist, and finding nothing to justify their conclusions in those published, concluded that they must be in the bye-laws; and if no evidence was there found, they dared to assert that the workmen were too cowardly to publish their bad rules, and therefore resorted to the device of embodying them in bye-laws, which were equally binding on the members, and were kept secret because of their tyrannical character, and the ends which they were intended to serve. Whenever and wherever trade unions have bye-laws, they are in accordance with, and subject to, the general laws; they never do and never can override the general rules of the union. Usually they contain nothing more objectionable than some few details for the management of the local branch of the union; they provide for such matters as pertain solely to the district, and which do not interfere with the general body. If they perchance contain anything more than mere details of local management, they do not extend to matters beyond the local customs and usages of the trade, or special arrangements made

with the employers, which are published in what is called a schedule of trade privileges.*

§ 33. Each trade or industry has its own union; these may be purely local—that is, confined to a particular town or district, or general, having a common centre, with branches or lodges in various parts of the country. Almost all trade societies were originally local unions—many of them still are; the latter are chiefly confined to those trades which are localised to special towns or districts, such as some of the hardware trades of Sheffield and Birmingham, the silk trades of Coventry and Macclesfield, the pottery trades of Staffordshire and Worcester, and the tanners of Bermondsey and elsewhere. Of late years there has been a tendency on the part of all trades to effect some kind of union by federation or otherwise between the several local bodies belonging to the same trade, with a view to concerted action, and for the purpose of direct mutual support, in case of need. Hence we find that some of the Sheffield and Birmingham trades have become united into one union. Co-operation in this sense is now becoming nearly universal.

§ 34. The general unions are composed of workmen belonging (1) to trades which are common to the entire country; or (2) to considerable portions of it. Of the former may be mentioned the engineering and iron trades, the building trades, the printing trades (exclusive of London), the shoemakers, tailors, etc.; of the latter class may be mentioned the cotton, woollen, and silk trades, miners, ironworkers, and many others which cover a considerable area, although limited to certain districts. Many of the larger unions are now called amalgamated societies, although the term was first applied in a different sense to that in which it is now generally used—it was adopted by the engineers in 1851 to denote the consolidation of the several branches of the engineering trades, with their independent societies, such as the fitters, pattern-makers, smiths, millwrights, and machinists, into one union, under a central executive, with a common fund, and governed by one code of rules, applicable to all alike. It is now frequently

* Even this provision is now exceptional. The Manchester Bricklayers had such schedules, and also some few other unions.

used in the sense of an amalgamation of the local and independent societies of a particular trade into one general union, such as the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, the Amalgamated Tailors' Society, etc.

§ 35. The extent, the wealth, and the material resources and power otherwise of some of these "Labour Associations" may be gathered from the annexed Tables, I. and II. Table I. is a reproduction of the figures originally given for 1876; Table II. gives similar figures for the year 1889, thus bringing them down to the 1st of January, 1890, for the purposes of comparison as to growth in numbers and funds, and their general progress as represented by income and expenditure. The aggregate totals show that, in 1876, the 17 societies enumerated had 2,723 branches, in various parts of the country, with a total membership of 212,763 financial members, having a total income of £384,673 3*s.* 9*d.*; and an aggregate expenditure of £338,208 19*s.* 8*d.*; and with a balance in hand amounting to £616,619 17*s.* 4*d.* In the year ending December 31st, 1889, the number of branches was 2,552, the total number of members being 216,634; while the total income had reached £530,755, and the expenditure £378,331; the balance in hand being £556,114.* The second table shows some changes in the relative position of the societies named; a few have not even held their own, while others have expanded and increased in strength. The weakness exhibited has been, generally speaking, in those unions which have adhered to the old lines; the progress being in those which have followed the example of the Amalgamated Engineers, by adding large friendly benefits to the previously existing trade protection benefits merely. Societies like the Engineers, the Ironfounders, the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, the Carpenters and Joiners, and the Compositors have a permanent hold upon their members, a hold which gathers strength in each successive year. In trade societies pure and simple the thread which binds the members is less strong, and the influence exercised is less durable in its general effects.

* For 1890 only 16 societies are given, there being no returns for the Scottish Masons.

Table I.—The Year 1876.

Examples of the Extent, Numbers, Income, Expenditure, and Wealth of the Unions.

Name of Society.	Number of— Branches.	Number of— Members.	Total Income.	Total Expenditure.	Total Balance in Hand.
Engineers	390	44,578	£120,206 10 1	£109,701 11 5	£275,146 15 9
Ironfounders	110	12,663	34,539 7 2	32,900 14 6	65,395 6 7
Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders ...	161	18,469	39,343 2 8	45,217 14 0	45,337 15 1
Steam-engine Makers	81	3,938	8,479 7 10	7,474 10 8	16,139 3 9
Ironworkers (Districts)	25	4,504	3,244 7 11	5,140 0 1	5,485 13 0
Carpenters, Amalgamated	318	16,038	39,848 1 8	25,038 8 6	70,109 13 10*
Do., Gen. Union	154	11,841	18,625 17 11	11,071 5 8	22,500 6 2
Stonemasons	373	26,330	33,014 6 9	29,415 6 0	15,963 1 9
Do., Scottish Society	108	12,800	9,500 0 0	6,750 0 0	16,190 14 5
Bricklayers, Manchester Order	125	7,833	9,814 10 8	8,265 2 10	8,730 9 0
Do., London Order	113	6,262	9,151 3 10	6,006 16 7	12,209 13 0
Plasterers	136	8,500	5,448 8 10	3,129 18 6	7,587 19 8
Tailors	335	14,738	23,048 8 2	19,857 3 0	17,517 2 10
Shoemakers	185	10,500	6,733 12 3	5,039 10 3	1,893 15 3
Typographical Society	91	4,720	5,328 4 7	5,702 7 10	2,130 5 4
London Society of Compositors	Nil	4,415	6,950 19 0	5,066 16 5	13,555 1 8
Ironmoulders (Scotland)	18	4,604	11,396 14 4	12,431 13 1	20,727 0 0
Number of Societies, 17.	2,723	212,763	£384,673 3 9	£338,208 19 8	£616,619 17 3

* Value of offices and other assets, £1,600; total worth, £74,762 15*s.* 11*d.*

Table II.—The Year 1889.

The Extent, Number of Members, Income, Expenditure, and Wealth of certain Unions, January 1st, 1890.

Name of Trade Union.	Number of— Branches.	Number of— Members.	Total Income.	Total Expenditure.	Total Balance in Hand.
Amalgamated Society of Engineers	469	60,728	£183,652	£132,642	£209,780
Steam-engine Makers' Society	93	5,500	15,303	9,516	19,357
Friendly Society of Ironfounders	114	13,805	39,800	26,005	33,888
Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders	227	33,441	104,523	56,655	100,896
Ironmoulders of Scotland	18	5,992	20,983	15,133	13,624
Iron and Steel Workers' Association (Districts)*...	10	1,046	802	922	1,051
Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners	471	26,472	75,069	59,824	53,140
General Union of Carpenters and Joiners... ...	60	1,623	3,193	3,022	601
The Stonemasons' Society	297	11,306	15,076	14,060	5,457
Operative Bricklayers—London	156	8,189	12,696	10,187	30,590
Do. do. Sheffield	79	1,238	1,370	1,237	741
Operative Plasterers' Society	74	1,915	2,009	2,121	1,943
Amalgamated Society of Tailors	353	15,276	20,953	19,836	16,043
Boot and Shoe Rivetters and Finishers	40	13,760	12,732	10,499	19,268
London Society of Compositors	Local, 1	7,955	14,242	11,502	25,432
Typographical Association	90	8,388	8,352	5,170	24,303
Total number of Societies, 16.	2,552	216,634	£530,755	£378,331	£556,114

* Figures for 1888, those for 1889 not yet published. Shillings and pence are omitted.

§ 36. In addition to the societies enumerated in the tables, there were in 1877 many unions of considerable extent, such as the National Association of Miners, with 25 districts, 90,000 members, and a Central Board of Management. The income of the Central Board for the year ending May, 1877, was £6,567 15*s.* 11*d.*; the expenditure was £6,304 17*s.* 5*d.*; the balance in hand being £1,860 5*s.* 4*d.* These amounts were quite independent of the income, expenditure, and balances in hand of the several districts. The principle upon which that Association was founded was that of simple federation; it was composed of numerous independent societies, each of which was self-governing and self-supporting, keeping its own funds, controlled by its own rules, directed by its own officers and committees, and fixing its own contributions and benefits; but in other respects acting in concert for the general good, especially in all matters affecting wages, hours of labour, conditions of employment, security to life and limb, and supporting each other with funds in all cases of strikes, lock-outs, or disputes of any kind with their employers. Some of the districts were strong in numbers, wealthy as regards funds, and had benefits nearly equal to some of the older unions. That Federation, like many others, went to pieces, although the district societies of which it was composed continued to exist; many of them having been subsequently reorganised, maintain their position to this day. The Miners' National Federation, of which so much was heard in the earlier part of the present year (1890), is a new association, founded in 1889. It is said to represent an aggregate of about 140,000 miners, embracing most of the coalfields of England, exclusive of Durham and Northumberland, with perhaps one or two other districts excepted. During the recent strike the following counties were prominently identified with the Federation, both in demands which were made, and in the action which was taken: Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, Leicestershire, Somersetshire, Warwickshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and to some extent Shropshire. This Federation is not established on quite the same basis as the one above

referred to. It is governed by a committee or council of delegates from the several districts, each of whom is paid so much per day, and travelling expenses, when engaged in federation work. In the event of a strike this council would disburse the levies in support of the men. But it has no power to override the rules or decisions of the several independent unions constituting the Federation. Its operations are more limited than those of the National Association of 1877; it has no Central Fund, in the sense of the latter, and its income and expenditure, except in case of a dispute, do not extend beyond what is needed for present purposes, as they arise from time to time. Possibly it is intended to be a permanent Federation, for "defence or attack," as the case may be. Its action just now is chiefly directed to the attainment of "an Eight Hour day, by Act of Parliament"; but it is also engaged in formulating a scheme, in conjunction with the Federation of Employers, for regulating wages, and piece-work prices, on the basis of the price of coal, or upon some other basis of an equitable character.

The extent and financial strength of some of the miners' unions may be inferred from the following figures, quoted in the first issue of this work in 1877. They are taken from the Government Returns for 1876:

Association.	Number of Members.	Total Income.	Balance in hand.
		£	£
Durham	38,000	44,694	76,296
Northumberland	18,711	12,506	30,154
West Yorkshire	8,000	31,303	22,616
West Bromwich	3,105	10,076	4,851
Derby and Leicester ...	992	3,238	2,231
Totals ...	68,808	£101,817	£136,148

There were several other miners' unions, both extensive in numbers and strong as regards funds. Since that date many

changes have taken place, some of which may be indicated by the following, covering, as far as possible, the same ground :

Association.	Number of Members.	Total Income.	Balance in hand.
		£	£
Durham, 1888	37,000	37,337	36,235
Northumberland, 1889... ...	15,144	8,594	9,420
West and South Yorkshire, 1888	10,000	9,402	10,901
West Bromwich, 1888	976	1,634	1,372
Leicestershire, 1888	1,143	656	176
Ashton and Haydock, 1888 ...	4,569	1,489	Nil
Totals ...	68,832	£59,112	£58,104

The figures above given do not adequately represent the total strength of the miners' unions on May-day, 1890, inasmuch as there has been an enormous accession of members within the last six months, in all the colliery districts. But the figures are not available either as to actual numbers, income, expenditure, or balance in hand, especially as regards Lancashire, Derbyshire, Leicester, Notts, Staffordshire, Somersetshire, Warwickshire, or Gloucestershire.

§ 37. Besides the societies before specified many other trades have large and powerful unions in various parts of the country. In 1877 the shipwrights had large and well-conducted unions along the banks of the Thames, the Mersey, the Tyne, the Wear, the Tees, the Clyde, and the Avon, and, indeed, at all the chief ports of the kingdom. The change from wood to iron and steel, in shipbuilding, has diminished the numbers and the power of the shipwrights as a body, but they are still influential in various parts of the country. The Associated Shipwrights' Society alone has 43 branches, with 5,450 members, the total income in 1889 being £7,599, the expenditure being £2,891, and the balance in hand £12,226. The Coopers, which in 1877 resolved to federate all their independent societies into one consolidated union, had at that time about 20,000 members, and aggregate funds amounting to over £30,000. The Federation does not appear to have been effective, and the latest returns seem to indicate a large falling-

off in total membership. There are, however, some local unions still in existence. The Coachmakers had, in 1877, a total of 7,973 members, with an aggregate income of £15,918; in 1888 they had only 4,790 members, with an aggregate income of £10,557; but there is now an Association of "Coach Ironworkers." The Brassworkers had some 5,000 members in 1877. Since that date there had been a decline in membership, and more recently a distinct revival. Other branches of the trade have separate independent societies, both national and local. The Cotton-spinners had 15,544 members in 1877; in 1888, the total number in the Amalgamated Association alone was 16,910, besides which the Operative Provincial Association had 5,630 members. The Power-loom Weavers had 16,600 members in 1877; in 1888, the Blackburn and District had 10,400, and another society in Blackburn, purely local, a membership of 1,757; while the Northern Counties Amalgamated Association of Weavers return a total membership of 33,756, its head-quarters being at Accrington. The textile trades have other associations in the chief centres of their respective industries. The "Cardroom hands" have, in two societies alone, 16,300 members; the weavers, warpers, and winders, in two societies, 6,700 members; in five other weavers' unions there were 5,043 members. The Framework-knitters had 2,800 members in 1877, in 1889 they had 4,000; while the Federated Society of the Midland Counties had 1,400. The Lacemakers of Nottingham had 4,000 members. The foregoing by no means exhausts the list of unions in connection with the textile trades of the country, and does not include Scotland in any case.*

§ 38. Perhaps the most notable fact of modern times, in connection with trade unions, is the rapid growth of vast organisations in the ranks of what is termed unskilled labour. The most conspicuous instance of the kind, at the date of the first issue of this work, was that of the Agricultural Labourers' Union, founded in 1872. This union, in a marvellously short

* The later returns are quoted from the last "Congress Reports," the "Labour Statistics Reports," and the Returns of the Registrar of Friendly Societies.

time, spread all over the entire kingdom. In 1877 there were three distinct unions, as follows: (1) The Agricultural Labourers' Union, whose head-quarters were at Leamington, was divided into 29 districts; it had 1,490 branches, and a total of 50,000 members, in round numbers. Its income in 1876 was £12,625, its expenditure £10,059, and its cash balance in hand was £6,843. (2) The Kent and Sussex Labourers' Union, whose head-quarters were at Maidstone, had 251 branches, and a total of 13,300 members. Its income in 1876 was £11,355, and its expenditure £8,587, the total balance in hand being £8,378. (3) The Amalgamated Labour League, whose head-quarters were at Boston, in Lincolnshire, had 31 branches, 10,000 members, an income of £3,167, and an expenditure of £2,861. In the year 1876, each of these unions had its own newspaper, an organ which circulated widely in the several districts, and even more widely, for they found subscribers in all parts of the country. The sphere of action of these unions was not wholly confined to labour questions, wages, hours of labour, and conditions of employment; they engaged largely in political movements, especially those having reference to the extension of the franchise, the redistribution of seats, local self-government, charitable endowments, and even extended to the relationship existing between Church and State. This activity no doubt exerted a wide-spread influence in the bye-elections immediately preceding 1880, and also at the general election in that year, and again in 1885, especially in county constituencies; and doubtless it was a factor of more importance in the election of county councils at a later date, as was predicted would be the case in the first issue of this work. The Amalgamated Labour League has collapsed, or nearly so. The Agricultural Labourers' Union still exists, but at the date of the last return, that for 1888, it only had 4,660 members, with a total income of £4,558, and a balance in hand of £3,464. The Kent and Sussex Union had, in the same year, 8,500 members, an income of £10,556, and a balance in hand of £7,435. These unions, and the movements they represented, seem to have exhausted the energies of those who inaugurated the organisations.

§ 39. The really notable feature in the trade unionism of to-day is the development of unions in the ranks of unskilled labour in the towns, as previously happened in the agricultural districts of the country, from 1872 to 1880. It is impossible to foretell the fate of the numerous labourers' unions which have sprung into existence within the last twelve months, or even accurately to state the precise number of their financial members. There is a tendency to exaggerate the numbers, as there is also the actual work accomplished, but the importance of a movement which has brought under discipline vast masses of men hitherto without the pale of definite organisation, cannot well be over-estimated. Mr. Ben Tillett had been busily engaged in organising sections of the men employed in connection with the docks for some time previous to the strike. The Tea Operatives' Union, which was the origin and nucleus of the Dockers' Union, was registered in January, 1888. It appears to have been started in the summer of 1887 as the "Tea Coopers' and General Labourers' Association," and to have comprised within its ranks labourers from all the docks and most of the wharves in London.* The number of members soon rose to 2,500 men, but it shortly afterwards fell to 300 men; at the date of the dockers' strike, August 14th, 1889, there were only 800 men in the union. According to the report read at the delegate meeting held at Toynbee Hall, on March 29th, 1890, the total membership was stated to be 50,000, of whom 25,000 were chiefly composed of dock and river-side labourers. At that date the balance in hand amounted to £10,000. It is obvious that a union springing from 800 members to 50,000 in the space of six months can hardly be said to be consolidated.

§ 40. Various sections of the labouring population taking heart by what the dockers had done, and were doing, formed themselves into unions, some under the banner of the "Dock, Wharf, River-side, and General Labourers' Union;" others, like the gas-stokers, into separate associations. In most of the large industrial centres of the country there are labour unions

* See "The Dockers' Story," *English Illustrated Magazine*, November, 1889.

of one kind and another, and grand schemes of federation are being promulgated with the view of concerted action. But the largest union, outside the Dockers' Union, of this class is that known as the "Sailors' and Firemen's National Amalgamated Union of Great Britain and Ireland," numbering, according to the credentials of its representatives at the Trade Union Congress, in September, 1889, some 65,000 members. For activity and work, though scarcely for actual success, this body vies with the Dockers' Union. The passion for combination is not merely confined to men. In many industries the women have been brought into union, and delicate ladies, of position and wealth, representing refinement and culture, have aided the movement, by sympathy, advocacy, and financial support. A dozen years or so ago, the very name of trade union was a term of reproach; now the movement is even fashionable. The railway servants had in union, in 1877, some 12,815 members; in 1888 it had 12,080, with an annual income of £20,652, and a balance in hand of £73,734. It fell in numbers in 1880 by reason of its reorganisation on a sounder financial basis; since that time it has been recovering itself. Similar progress to that detailed in the preceding pages is observable generally in other unions, both as to numbers and funds.

§ 41. But even those figures, astonishing as many of them are in their grand totals, give but a faint idea of the extent, power, and importance of this great social and even political force, and of its ramifications all over the country. There is scarcely a town in Great Britain in which there are not several of these unions, or local branches of the larger ones, whose seat of government is situate in one of the great centres of industry. The total number of independent societies cannot be far short of 3,000. In London, Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield, Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Nottingham, Glasgow, Dublin, and other towns, they form a perfect network of organised forces, existing for good or for evil side by side, and which, on emergency, can be called into active operation, backed by immense material resources and voting power. So numerous are these trade societies, that no single trade long in existence, of which one ever heard the name, is without its union, and

even the names of some of them are unknown to the general public. The total number of workmen, in all grades, who are thus combined cannot be less than 1,500,000; over half a million have been represented, directly or indirectly, at some of the annual Trade Union Congresses. The annual income must very nearly approximate to £2,000,000 sterling, and their total reserve funds are hardly less than that sum, for sixteen societies alone have a balance in hand of about £556,114. Even this, however, does not represent the entire actual and available force of these industrial organisations, for the unions can count upon the moral support, and in case of need, the temporary contributions, of vast numbers of workmen who are not regular members of the society. For all practical purposes, therefore, the unions may be regarded as representing the fighting strength of the whole body of the skilled workmen; inasmuch as they have been steadily increasing in numbers, in extent, and in compactness of organisation during the last thirty years, so that the flower of Britain's artisan and labouring population are now embraced within their pale; and this cumulative force is being uniformly extended and consolidated, and reduced to regularity and order.

§ 42. Trade unionism is essentially an English institution; it is one of the great social and political forces which claims recognition on account of its innate strength; it is the one grand movement in which the working classes have confidence, and to which they devote their energies and their time. In the matter of contributions there is nothing like it in the entire history of associative effort, for in addition to their regular weekly subscriptions the members of a union have been known, by their own vote, to levy themselves to the extent of five shillings a week, or one-sixth of their whole weekly earnings, for months together, to maintain the union. During the terrible depression in trade, which followed the great failure of Overend, Gurney, & Co., and others, in 1866, the Ironfounders not only did this, but some of them actually took the savings of years, to the amount of £2,500, and deposited it with the committee in order to save the union from insolvency, and enable it to meet all dues and demands; and the executive

themselves became sureties for much larger amounts, in order to save the society. At the end of 1869 they were actually in debt to the extent of £5,450 18*s.* 8½*d.*, but they stood manfully together, and weathered the storm. During the three years, 1867-8-9, this one society paid to their out-of-work members £91,730 16*s.* 10*d.*, and for emigration £1,486 4*s.* 4*d.*, a large proportion of which was subscribed by those who were in work, over and above the ordinary weekly contributions.

§ 43. Nor is it alone in the matter of regular payments to their own society that they are distinguished, for they will give money by thousands to help other bodies of unionists when in distress, and will levy themselves voluntarily for weeks together, in support of some struggling union, whose members are engaged in an unequal contest with their employers, if the dispute be what they consider a fair one. They will also lend money, if they cannot afford to give, on the mere note of hand of the officers of a union needing the advance, if they are properly authorised and empowered to borrow by a vote of their society; and it is seldom that their promises of repayment are dishonoured. Commercial men would stare with astonishment if asked to advance loans on similar security; but commercial morality is scarcely on a par with trade union morality in money matters, whatever may be said of them in other respects.

§ 44. In their nature and constitution trade unions are essentially non-political and non-sectarian; men of every shade of political opinion, or of religious belief, belong to the same society, without in any way compromising their own special views, or sacrificing their individual independence. There have been instances in which there appears to have been a kind of political tinge in some of their public movements, but these exceptional cases have been of a special and particular kind, rather than of a general character. Such, for instance, were their processions and rejoicings when the duties levied on the importation of corn were abolished; but in that case the action taken was more from social than political motives, because, from the union point of view, the abolition had an indirect reference to wages, inasmuch as the high price of bread was equivalent to a depreciation of wages. During the civil war in America, the

feeling of trade unionists was almost uniformly on the side of the North, but it was the unionists, rather than the unions, who took an active part in support of Mr. Lincoln's government; and even in that case the subject was regarded as a question of labour—free labour *versus* slave labour—and the cause of free labour, to their credit be it said, called forth the most ardent sympathies of the industrial classes of England, and excited their enthusiasm for emancipation.

§ 45. There can be no doubt but that the agitation carried on by the Reform League, which eventually led to the Reform Bill of 1867, was greatly aided by the adhesion of the trade unionists of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the valuable support which they gave to the movement. But even in this instance only a few of the unions actually took part in the agitation by a vote of the members, as such, although in the mass the members obeyed the call of their leaders in demanding the extension of the suffrage. One of the most potent reasons for their joining that movement was to be found in the fact that they were suffering from coercive laws which they could not get repealed, and from the harshness with which they were administered; and at the same time their funds were placed at the mercy of any dishonest officer who chose to plunder them, for protection by law was wholly denied.

§ 46. The subsequent agitations for extending the franchise to those living in the counties, on the same basis as that existing for boroughs, was actively taken up by the Agricultural Labourers' Unions, and by the Miners' Unions, supported more or less by other trade societies, was more directly political than most other agitations in which they took part; but even in this case the unionists regarded it rather as a social measure than as a political one, for they looked upon the right to vote, or the possession of the suffrage, as a means whereby they would be enabled to exercise a more direct influence, socially as well as politically, than they could do without the vote. Moreover, political power has a great deal to do with the administration of justice, which affects the labourers and miners in the villages more than it does workmen in the majority of the boroughs, where public opinion exercises a controlling influence such as

cannot be felt in the agricultural and mining districts of the country.

§ 47. There is still another instance in which the trade unions, as such, took an active part—namely, in favour of protecting the seamen belonging to our mercantile marine. When it was declared by Mr. Plimsoll, M.P., and others, that sailors were being drowned wholesale, by means of unseaworthy ships, and from other causes which were partly, if not wholly, preventible, and when not actually drowned were exposed to dangers and hardships, through the neglect of proper care and supervision, to which they ought not to have been exposed, the trade unions of England, in a manner worthy of all praise, either voted money from their funds, or collected it through their lodges, to the extent of nearly £10,000, in aid of the movement. But here again it was not in any sense a purely political act; it arose from a knowledge of the common dangers to which all workmen are exposed when following a hazardous calling, aggravated in this instance by the fact that the merchant seamen were least able to protect themselves, having no adequate means of organisation, and hence the unionists contended that by legislative interference alone could the proper precautions be taken to ensure safety. Otherwise than in the instances quoted above, the unions usually eschew party politics, each member being at full liberty to join any political society or party, and to take any part he pleases in regard to any and every political movement or question. Hence we find every variety of political opinion reflected by the members of these unions, some of whom belong to one party, some to another, and some to no party at all.

§ 48. There cannot be a doubt, however, but that in recent years the unions are more alive to the necessity for political activity than heretofore; they are ready to respond to the call of duty, especially when the appeal is made by their old and trusted leaders—the men to whose energy, ability, and persistent advocacy, the passing of those laws which have removed former disabilities, and others of an enabling character, was mainly due. There is, therefore, this new element to be considered in politics, useful because of the numbers, organisation, and

discipline of the unions, but in no sense revolutionary, although, from the very nature of the training, it is essentially democratic. The wise statesman and the acute party leader will do well to understand this significant fact, and frankly to appeal to these bodies for support, by reason of their importance.

§ 49. These unions are in their essential characteristics social and industrial; their objects being the promotion of the well-being of their members in all matters pertaining to their daily life and labour. The means by which the ends are sought are various, but in general the objects are the same in all unions, although the methods adopted vary according to the circumstances of the trade, the extent of the organisation, and the nature of the employment. The principal objects may be thus classified and described: (1) To procure for their members the best return for their labour in the shape of higher wages, shorter hours of labour, and the enforcement of certain restrictions as to the conditions of employment, which could not be accomplished except by means of combination; (2) To provide mutual assurance for the members by means of pecuniary assistance in case of sickness, accident, death, out of work, superannuation when disabled by old age, loss of tools by fire, and sometimes emigration.

§ 50. The organisation and government of these unions, and the methods by which they are carried on, are as follows: (1) They are unlimited as to numbers; every individual workman in the trade is free to become a member, and is invited and offered inducements to join, provided he is qualified to work as a journeyman, and is capable of earning the current wages of the place or town in which he is working. (2) The age at which a young man may join the society is usually fixed at twenty-one years of age, that being the term when he has finished his apprenticeship if bound, and also the age when he attains his legal majority; under that age the law regards him as an "infant." Provision is, however, commonly made for juniors and apprentices to join at sixteen or eighteen years of age, but they are not allowed to vote on any question, and in some cases are not allowed to take their seat in the lodge; but they are otherwise entitled to participate in the benefits of the

union. (3) Each new member is personally elected by the members of the society, or in the case of a general union, by the lodge or branch. In no single instance does it appear that such authority is relegated to a committee or council. (4) The method of election is as follows: The candidate is proposed by one member and seconded by another at an ordinary meeting-night of the branch—this is called nomination. In most societies the candidate is not expected to be present on this first occasion, but his proposer must pay down one-half or one-third, according as the rules of the union provide, of the entrance fee; this varies from five to twenty shillings, in very few societies does it exceed the latter sum. This amount is generally paid in two or three instalments, one at the time of nomination, another on the night of election, and if divided into three equal parts, the third on the next meeting-night following the election. (5) The proposer must know the candidate personally, and must have worked with him, so as to be able to vouch for his abilities as a workman, and that "he is a fit and proper person to be admitted into the society as a member," and that he is capable of earning the current wages of the district where he seeks admission into the union. The seconder must also be able to speak as to his character and ability, but he need only speak from general knowledge of the fitness of the candidate, and he may add that this has been obtained from the lips of others to whom the candidate was known. (6) At the meeting-night next following, unless prevented by some sufficient cause, in which case the meeting-night after, the candidate must attend in person, and answer any questions that may be put to him, in open lodge, by any member. If the answers are deemed satisfactory, he is at once admitted as a member of the union. If any doubt should arise, he is requested to leave the room, when the reasons are given by the objecting member; he is then recalled, and asked by the president to explain everything of a doubtful character; on this being done to the satisfaction of the lodge, he is admitted. The proposer and seconder undertake the responsibility of his defence if he is attacked by any one during his absence; but it is a universal rule not to mention to the candidate any of the objections urged against him by any

member except those agreed to by the whole lodge, and these are stated clearly and dispassionately by the president. (7) He is first asked if he is willing to become a member; having answered in the affirmative, he is then asked if he knows anything about the general rules and regulations of the union into which he seeks admission, to which he generally replies that his proposer has explained the nature of them to him. The president then proceeds to read some of the principal rules to him as he stands before the lodge; to these he must audibly give his assent, after which a formal declaration is made by the president that he is admitted as a member and consents to be bound by the rules. The president then takes him by the hand, in token of brotherhood and good-fellowship, and he is then passed on to the secretary to be enrolled as a member, a copy of the rules is given to him, and he takes his seat in the lodge.

§ 51. This ceremony of "initiation" is usually very simple, but at the same time, especially in some societies, impressive; each member in the lodge has to stand "uncovered"—that is, with his hat off—while the president reads the rules and the form of admission, every decorum is observed by those present, no one is allowed to enter or depart, and every courtesy is paid to the new member.

§ 52. Each society or union is governed by a committee or council, elected by and from the general body of the members by universal suffrage, each member having the right to one vote. The term for which they are elected varies from three months in some local unions to twelve months in the general unions. In the larger societies, such as the amalgamated unions, they are usually elected either half-yearly or yearly; the vote is taken on the quarterly, or on a specially summoned meeting-night; in some cases it is by show of hands or open voting in the lodge-room, in others it is by ballot-papers which have to be filled up and returned to the lodge on the night specified on the voting-paper. These ballot-papers are examined and counted in each lodge by special officers called "tellers," elected for the purpose; the votes given are then read to the lodge for the purpose of verification. The numbers are then sent to the executive and

published in the fortnightly, monthly, or quarterly returns, so that each branch may see that the numbers are correctly quoted and stated. There is no possible opportunity of "cooking" these returns, as every member of the society has the power to challenge their exactitude, if they have the appearance of being wrong.

§ 53. In the larger societies the committee of management are called the "central" or "executive" council or committee; and their decision is regarded as final upon all questions on which the laws or rules are "silent"—that is, where cases arise not already provided for or are not clearly defined in the rules. A decision thus arrived at by the executive stands good until the annual or delegate meeting, or until the laws are revised. In some grave cases a special delegate meeting may be called for the purpose of discussing the subject, but this would only be done in a matter of vital importance. A delegate meeting usually consists of one or more delegates from each branch of the union, or in some cases of districts where several small branches are formed into a kind of local federation, so as to avoid unnecessary expense or too great numbers, in which event they elect a delegate or delegates from this district centre; this is sometimes called a general council, in contradistinction to the executive council, and they can reverse a decision of such executive or central council. Generally speaking, these councils or committees of management are purely executive or merely administrative bodies, they cannot make laws, alter, or override them.

§ 54. The officers of these unions generally consist of a president, vice-president, treasurer, and secretary; they are subject at all times to the control of the committee of management, but not elected by them, nor can they be removed from office except in case of fraud or some grave misconduct, although there have been instances where they have been suspended. The officers of the larger bodies are elected annually by ballot in precisely the same way as the members of the council, each member being entitled to vote. In addition to these general officers of the entire union, each branch or lodge has its own officers, consisting of president, treasurer, secretary, and "tylers"

or stewards, whose duty it is to keep order in the lodge-room, examine the cards of the members to see if they are "in limits" or within benefit, or in arrears of contribution, to prevent strangers or excluded members from entering the lodge.

§ 55. The funds of trade unions are now usually entrusted to special officers called trustees, who are responsible for their safe custody. All moneys are banked in their joint names, and all moneys are withdrawn by them; they also hold all the securities of the society, and they are made answerable in law for their safe custody. The law is very severe and stringent with regard to trustees, but they are not liable if any losses arise from circumstances beyond their control.

§ 56. It is a strange fact, but true nevertheless, that until very recently the funds of trade unions were absolutely unprotected by law, and in consequence thereof some serious defalcations took place. But it is even more strange that, notwithstanding the inducement, for it deserves no other name, held out to dishonest persons to embezzle the funds of these societies, the defalcations were by no means numerous, considering the temptation offered and the immunity given to the offenders. If we compare the number of frauds in those societies, with the number committed in ordinary insurance societies and joint-stock companies, we are struck by their fewness and the limited amount of the fraudulent transactions. But the mere fact that the members of these unions were left so long without the protection of law was a scandal and disgrace to the legislature. Happily it has now been removed, although in the first instance it was due to a law not passed with that intention at all, but rather to one having reference to co-partnerships. This was by 31 and 32 Vict. cap. 116 (1869), entitled, "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Larceny and Embezzlement," commonly known as Russell Gurney's Act. Subsequently, in 1871, the funds of trade unions, if registered under the Act, were protected by 34 and 35 Vict. cap. 31; this protection was further extended by 39 and 40 Vict. cap. 22, especially by sections iii. and iv. These industrial organisations, with their vast funds, have now that protection by the State which has ever been accorded to the funds of

other corporate bodies, but which was so long most unrighteously denied to trade unions.*

§ 57. The books and accounts of trade unions are audited by members of the society specially elected for the purpose: (1) Each branch has its own auditors for the branch accounts; these audits are quarterly, the report of such auditors is read in open lodge, and is open to criticism by any and all of the members. These reports are then sent to the central office and are published in the returns or reports, so that they are made known to every branch and indeed every member of the society. In the case of any discrepancy arising in the lodge accounts, or if any is alleged to have arisen, the executive have the power to send either the officers or auditors of the general body, or a member or members, specially appointed by them, to examine into every detail and to report thereon to the executive council. If it be found that any misappropriation of moneys or fraud has been committed, the executive have power to at once take proceedings and obtain legal remedy. (2) In addition to the branch audits the general accounts of the society have to undergo a periodical audit by specially elected auditors; every detail of the income and expenditure is given in the annual reports, so that each branch can check its own payments and receipts, and at the same time supervise the entire accounts of the whole body. Should any defalcations occur, the committee of management are empowered to suspend the officers who are guilty, or suspected of being guilty, until an investigation has taken place; when, if proven to have committed a breach of trust, they may be prosecuted. The trustees are usually the prosecutors, but any officer duly authorised by the rules may be the prosecutor in a court of law.† It is a creditable feature in the conduct of these unions that, notwithstanding the vast sums of money annually passing through the hands of their officers, very few actual frauds are perpetrated, and these are not usually for any serious amounts. Certain little irregularities sometimes occur in the lodge accounts; but even these are

* For further particulars see Howell's "Handy Book of the Labour Laws," pp. 42–49 inclusive.

† Ibid.

infrequent, especially when it is remembered that many of the branch officers are uneducated men, who never had a lesson in book-keeping in the whole of their lives; and in most instances when they do occur, they are not the result of dishonesty, but of mere carelessness, negligence, or confusion, from lack of time or want of method in book-keeping. As a rule these societies hesitate to institute a criminal prosecution against their officers until every opportunity has been given to them to make restitution and to pay a fine for the wrong done; if they wilfully and knowingly withhold the property and refuse to refund the same when required to do so, they are then left to the tender mercies of the law. But they do not seek to make men criminals, if they can avoid the necessity of doing so.

§ 58. The salaries paid to the chief officers of these wealthy unions are moderate in the extreme, in too many cases they are even niggardly. The accusation often levelled against these men, that they are highly paid officials, is absolutely the reverse of truth; if the unions err it is on the side of economy, not of liberality, towards those entrusted with the management of such vast organisations of labour, whose chief object is better pay for their members. If we compare the salaries paid by these large societies, with those paid by limited liability companies, insurance offices, friendly societies, and even charitable and benevolent institutions, we can discover no tendency towards reckless expenditure or undue wastefulness of the funds. The terms "bloated delegates" and "fat officials" are mere fictions, invented by those who are either ignorant of the facts, or who wilfully misrepresent the case to suit a despicable purpose, with the object of trying to create distrust on the part of workmen against the unions. It is often a cruel slander against honourable men, but it loses its effect on those for whom it is intended, although it has had the effect of imposing on the general public. The general secretaries of these unions, as indeed all the other officials, have to be elected annually, or oftener, so that if any fault could be found with their conduct, in any particular, they would be liable to dismissal, without compensation of any kind. This ordeal is more severe than many suppose, for often there are candidates for the post. If, therefore, the management has

been lax, or it can be shown that any neglect has occurred, there are plenty of men both willing and able to criticise the secretary's conduct. These annual elections are frequently very trying and harassing to the occupant of the post, but they operate healthily for the society.

§ 59. In substantiation of the preceding paragraph, the following salaries, paid to their officers, by some of the larger unions, may be quoted:

Name of Society.	1877.		1889.	
	Total Number of Members.	Yearly Salary.	Total Number of Members.	Yearly Salary.
Amalgamated Engineers	45,071	£208	60,728	£208
Steam-engine Makers	4,124	130	5,500	156
Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders	19,660	156	30,000	208
Ironfounders	12,612	130	13,805	143
Amalgamated Carpenters	16,829	156	26,472	156
Stonemasons	22,733	156	11,306	130
Bricklayers, London Order	6,749	156	8,189	156
Ditto, Manchester Order	8,033	208	1,238	208
Plasterers	6,025	156	1,915	156
Amalgamated Tailors	14,408	156	15,276	156
Boot and Shoe Rivetters and Finishers	4,369	117	13,760	156
Compositors, London	4,480	156	7,955	200
Typographical Association	5,309	130	8,388	150

It thus appears that the highest salary paid to any general secretary does not exceed £208 per annum. The payments to presidents or chairmen of the central executive, vary from 1*s.* per meeting-night to £40 per year. The treasurers get from 1*s.* per meeting-night to £20 per year; but the latter are paid for loss of time when banking money, or withdrawing sums for society purposes. The local or branch officers are usually paid according to the number of financial members, thus: if we take 300 as the basis of computation, the quarterly payments will average something like the following: secretaries in the Masons' Society, £1 16*s.* 6*d.*; Engineers, £2 18*s.* 9*d.*; Boiler-makers

and Iron-shipbuilders, £3 15*s.*; in the Ironfounders, £5; the latter being the highest in the list. It therefore appears that the highest amount paid to branch secretaries will not exceed £20 per annum for 300 members, and few branches exceed that number; hence there are sometimes several branches in a large town, such as Leeds, Manchester, etc. The payments to branch presidents vary from 6*d.* to 1*s.* per meeting-night, or from 6*s.* 6*d.* to 13*s.* per quarter. It rarely exceeds the higher amount named. The payments to branch treasurers vary from 1*s.* per meeting-night to £5 per quarter, the latter being the highest sum paid, except when they have to lose time on society business, when they receive the current rate of pay per hour in the district. The auditors are usually paid about 1*s.* per night when engaged on audit, but in some instances they get as much as 6*s.* 6*d.* per quarter. For auditing the general accounts they are paid by the day, at the current rates of the district. The tylers or stewards are similarly paid 1*s.* per lodge-night for their services. The payments enumerated are so ridiculously small in comparison with the time and labour given, especially when contrasted with the amounts paid for similar services in other associations, that the wonder is that anybody can be found foolish enough to believe that trade union officials luxuriate in extravagant salaries and high living, or that their appointments are veritable sinecures, except in so far as they employ their time in promoting or meddling with labour disputes. In connection with the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, the Miners, the Iron and Steel-workers, and a few other bodies, another class of men are employed, styled delegates; these men give the whole of their time to the work, and are paid from £104 to £156 per annum for their services. Otherwise, delegates on special business are paid so much per day, the amount covering all hotel and incidental expenses, except railway and other fares which are charged in their bill. But trade unions are the last to pay any extravagant sums for any such services.

§ 60. In the general cost of management must be included several items above and beyond the salaries paid to the officials, such as the rent of offices, rent of rooms for the weekly meetings

of the branches, printing, postage, and other necessary outlay arising out of the management of extensive organisations with branches in every part of the country. This expenditure again will fairly bear comparison with that of any similar societies and is not in any case excessive ; in some instances it is scarcely adequate to the requirements of the association. For example : (1) The office accommodation in all cases is moderate in the extreme, in some positively humble, when we consider the wealth of the union, the work to be done, and the uses to which the offices are put. Thus the rent for offices of the Amalgamated Engineers, with an annual income of £183,652, is only £140 ; the house serves as the residence of the general secretary, the meeting-place of the executive committee, which meet four or five times weekly, and for the despatch of all parcels and packages to all parts of the country. It is the same with every other general office, the annual income and rent of some of the principal unions being as follows : The Ironfounders, annual income, £39,800 ; rent, £45 yearly. The Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners, annual income, £75,069 ; rent, £80, calculated at 5 per cent. on the value of their own freehold, which cost nearly £1,600. The Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, annual income, £104,525 ; rent, £50. This body is now building its own offices. The London Society of Compositors, with an annual income of £14,242 ; rent, £130 ; this includes a library and reading-room, and place of rendezvous for the members. The Operative Bricklayers have built a fine hall, as well as offices ; the Plasterers also built offices at Birmingham. The rent of offices by the Steam-engine Makers, the Tailors, the Masons, and all other unions are similarly moderate, the premises being unpretentious, and even humble, when compared with institutions of all other kinds in the country.

(2) The rent of rooms for the weekly meetings of the branches is an annually increasing item ; at one time the club-rooms of public-houses were freely placed at the disposal of these societies, without payment of rent, the landlord recouping himself by the profits arising from the sale of intoxicating liquors sold during the evening. Of late years the members either drink a good deal less, or the landlords are less satisfied

with the expenditure, and hence there is a charge for rent and gas. In many lodge-rooms drink is absolutely prohibited during business hours, in all there is now a tendency to the greatest moderation and even abstinence. There is also a growing desire to obtain rooms other than those in the public-house, but they are not generally available, hence the public-house is often a necessity and not a choice. School-rooms have often been applied for but have been usually refused, so that the drinking shop has been simply a refuge, on the principle of any port in a storm; it has resolved itself into Hobson's choice, that, or nothing.

§ 61. Printing and postage are usually large items of expenditure in a trade society, for this simple reason, that every member is entitled to the fullest knowledge of every detail of the management and expenditure of the union to which he belongs; he has to be consulted in reference to, and vote on every question affecting the conduct of the society, and the welfare of its members. Many of the larger unions have a monthly report or circular, with the Masons it is fortnightly; there is also a quarterly report, and then the annual; these have to be sent from the general office to the several branches by whom they are delivered to the members. Some of the elaborate annual reports are models of excellence and arrangement, every detail is given with a minuteness which few incorporated associations would like to imitate, but which is essential for the full protection of all those who contribute to their funds. Very few published reports will bear comparison with those of the Engineers, Ironfounders, Amalgamated Carpenters, Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, the Steam-engine Makers, Masons, and Tailors, either for fulness, completeness, or arrangement. After detailing every item of the branch and general office accounts, admirable summaries or tables are given, showing at a glance the sources and amount of income, and the expenditure under distinct heads in each branch of the society.

§ 62. Delegations represent the cost of sending delegates to various parts of the country on special business connected with the affairs of the society, such as in reference to disputes,

arbitrations, conferences, congresses, special meetings, etc. It is alleged that the "bloated delegates" live like princes, at the expense of their poorer brethren. But the payments are fixed by the members themselves and not by the delegates; they work to a scale, every item of charge being fixed—the class by which they shall travel, the allowance for hotel expenses, and the payments per diem—so that there is little chance of luxurious living, or wasteful extravagance. It is no unusual thing for a delegate to expend more than his allowance, in which case he has to bear the extra cost himself. He looks upon his election as an honour, and will make some little sacrifice to keep up appearances, when he is out on the society's business. As a rule they are the select men of their trade, and as they are in the habit of living respectably at home, so they expect similar comforts when away from home on business.

§ 63. The investment of the funds of trade unions is often an object of great anxiety in consequence of the necessity of their being at all times available for immediate use. For this reason very few of the unions have ever attempted to invest their funds in real property, Government securities, or commercial speculations of any kind.* These accumulated funds, therefore, as a rule, only realise the lowest rate of interest, as they are mostly on deposit in the joint-stock banks, or in the Post Office Savings' Bank. At one time a most pernicious system generally prevailed, namely, the publicans, where the branches met, were the treasurers for the funds, often having a large sum in hand; the brewers and distillers were made the bankers, large deposits being often placed in their hands. Since the establishment of Post Office Savings' Banks, and the alterations in the law regarding the funds of trade unions, this system has almost totally disappeared. But it deserves to be recorded that very few cases occurred in which the union was defrauded by the publicans to whose care the funds were entrusted, even although at law these funds were not at that time recoverable. And in no case did brewers or distillers omit to repay the amounts confided to them.

* The Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, the London Society of Compositors, and a few other unions now invest in Corporation property.

§ 64. It is a great misfortune that the large funds of the unions cannot be put to better use than to be left at the bankers on deposit account; but under existing circumstances, with the constant fluctuations in trade, with the possibility of a trade dispute always staring the unions in the face, it is scarcely possible to do otherwise. With a better understanding between the employer and the employed, with fewer strikes and lock-outs, these funds might be made available for building houses for their members, on the principle of a mutual benefit building society; temporary loans to their prudent and thrifty members; and in other ways which would be for the advantage of the members, and at the same time bring profit to the society as an investment.

§ 65. Among the many public and personal advantages conferred by trade unions may be mentioned the following: (1) The discipline enforced upon the members; they are a law unto themselves. Everything is done regularly and with order. It is a reign of law, self-imposed and self-regulating; the members are taught to rely first upon themselves, and then to support each other in case of need. Although submitting, as in all other cases, to the rule of the majority, the minority have the utmost freedom either to criticise, or to seek, by creating a majority, to amend anything in the rules and mode of action to which they object. Society itself is based on the same conditions, and every association must conform to these natural methods of self-government. (2) Discipline gives systematic form and force to the general conclusions arrived at by the entire body of the members. As isolation is weakness, so unity is strength, not in funds alone, important as these are, but also in the concentrated energy of numbers, which by its indirect power exerts more influence than is often done by its direct action. This is the reason why strikes are fewer with powerful, wealthy, and well-organised societies like those of the engineers, ironfounders, carpenters, compositors, etc., than they are with smaller societies, or those recently established. (3) The restraints of such societies are often conducive to strict sobriety, for no one is allowed in the lodge-rooms if intoxicated; moreover they engender a spirit of self-respect and at the same

time a respect for the feelings of others with whom they are frequently brought into contact. (4) They inculcate thrift on the part of the members, for they are constantly discussing questions of ways and means, and have to look forward to times of depression or of discontent, and to provide the funds needful for any and every emergency. (5) They encourage emulation among their members, both as to methods of work and skill, for a drone or a botch is alike the subject of ridicule and contempt, whereas a competent workman is the pride of the lodge and of the trade. (6) They have also an educational and elevating tendency on the character of the individual, for as each member has the fullest opportunity of expressing his opinions on every point brought before the lodge, of discussing the *pros* and *cons* of every question, so he seeks to acquit himself creditably before his brother members; he is thus fitted to debate matters of the highest importance, and is trained to reason on subjects which involve the interests of tens of thousands of persons beyond his own narrow circle. As a means of political training, few associations can claim equal merit, although the full force and extent of this all-pervading influence are not as yet widely developed.

§ 66. The scope and power of this influence are not confined to those who are, for the time being, members of the union. They extend more or less to all the workmen in the trade, for the organised energy of the union is felt everywhere, even when at rest, and it affects the whole class of British workmen, in all places and at all times. The importance of these unions, therefore, cannot be overrated, and consequently it is all the more necessary that the public should know accurately and fully the objects of the trade societies, and the means by which the members seek to obtain them. In this way those who attempt to estimate their value, to criticise their deficiencies and pass judgment on their acts and deeds, will be able to do so with some intelligence, and some appreciation of the work in which they are engaged.

§ 67. Since the preceding pages of this chapter were first written, in 1877, there has been actually no new departure, or developments, in the character, the objects, or the *modus*

operandi of trade unions. They have, indeed, scarcely had any new experiences, although they have, some of them especially, passed through vicissitudes more or less trying, and consequently have required much skill and patience on the part of their leaders, and of self-denial and loyal obedience on the part of the rank and file of the members, to enable them to weather the storm. The most severe ordeal was in 1879, in which year some societies were barely able to hold their own, and meet their multifarious financial engagements, in consequence of the acute depression in trade in that and the two previous years. Their vitality, and the extent of their recuperative power, were, however, soon manifest when trade began to revive; and now, after ten further years of varying experience, they are stronger in point of numbers, and in available resources, and more potent also in their influence, than ever they were before. It is said that "imitation is the sincerest form of flattery;" if that be so, then trade unions are more flattered to-day than any other form of association, for bodies of men who, when this work was first written, used to revile the unions, and calumniate the leaders, are now found imitating their example, and even using the name, not only without a blush of shame, but with evident satisfaction and hearty approval. In parliament, trade unions are treated with due consideration and respect. The proposals of their leaders are no longer derided, and dismissed with scorn and contempt; their representatives are not talked at as formerly, but are consulted upon measures and matters relating to labour. For so short a period the change is indeed marvellous.

§ 68. Within the last two or three years there has grown up a disposition, on the part of a few men, comparatively new to the trade union movement, to disparage the work of the unions, and detract from the labours of those who have made them what they are, and have won for them their present position as recognised lawful institutions in the land. These men deprecate the introduction of the Friendly Society element into trade unions, on the supposition that the latter are thereby weakened. They contend that the trade union should be maintained for strike or trade purposes only, for attack or

defence, as the case may be, in matters directly relating to labour, such as wages, hours of work, modes of hiring and of pay, overtime, and the like. They are pleased to style this "the new trade unionism." Herein they display their utter ignorance of the history of labour movements, and of the origin and development of trade unions. The form of organisation which they advocate is nothing more than a revival of older forms, long since discarded by the better class of modern trade unions; it is the cruder and ruder form which existed when the very idea of associative effort, for mutual aid and support, was in its infancy. This stage has been passed. Any return towards it would be a retrograde step. Unions based on such old lines still exist, and have existed from time to time all through the present century. But their history has been usually one of mutability, often of failure. The modern trade union, with its manifold benefits, is the offspring of progress, the outcome of experience, and the type of association which is destined to survive all attacks from its enemies, whether from within or without its own ranks.

CHAPTER IV.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. Political economy has been defined by Thomas Carlyle as "the dismal science." As expounded by some writers on the subject, it might be termed the "grab-all science," for, according to their conceptions, its fundamental principles seem to be on a par with the advice : "Make money, honestly if you can, but make money." Many writers on political economy appear to have been blessed with the notion that the be-all and end-all of existence is the accumulation of wealth ; they endeavour to raise the low selfishness of human nature into the dignity of a scientific law, and then they worship it as the grand idea of humanity. The Right Honourable G. J. Goschen, M.P., in a speech delivered in the House of Commons, June 29, 1877, on the proposal to assimilate the county to the borough franchise, said that "it appeared to him that political economy had been dethroned in that House, and that philanthropy had been allowed to take its place. Political economy was the bugbear of the working class, and philanthropy was its idol." He opposed the motion because, in his opinion, "the reign of numbers, if it endangered nothing else, endangered political economy."* In other words political economy and philanthropy are incompatible, *ergo*, as the sequence of such logic, Christianity is a farce, and the teachings of Christ are a delusion and a snare.

§ 2. There would appear to be more truth in the allegations

* In a speech delivered on the eve of May-day, 1890, the same right honourable gentleman referred to the Labour Question, in a tone much more commendable, because more humane.

of the right honourable gentleman than most persons are disposed to admit. If we compare side by side the doctrines of Christianity and the theories put forward by political economists, we shall discover some things which can scarcely be reconciled, and consequently if we accept the one we shall find that we must discard the other. For example, Christianity says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" "Do unto others as ye would that men should do unto you;" "Love one another;" "Bear ye one another's burthens." Passages of similar import could be cited in abundance, but these will suffice. Political economy, on the other hand, practically says, love thyself; seek thine own advantage; promote thine own welfare; put money in thy purse; the welfare of others is not thy business, let them see to it for themselves. It is for the Christian Church to rebut these materialistic theories, in so far as they are incompatible with, or run counter to, the doctrines of the New Testament. The object of the following pages is to combat some of the axioms of economical writers in so far as they affect labour, and the condition of the masses of the people who work that they may live.

§ 3. Political economists, or those who assume to speak in their name, assure us "that there is a science of production, definite, distinct, exact, the axioms of which are as universal and demonstrable as those of astronomy, the practical rules of which are as simple and familiar as those of arithmetic." "But when we come to study the science we certainly do not find this agreement amongst its professors. Agreement is the last thing they think of. There are, indeed, few subjects of human thought on which there is less. There are hardly ten generalisations in the whole science on which all the writers are at one, and that not on the details but on the first principles; not on intricate points of practice, but on the general laws of production. Indeed, we find ourselves not in a science properly so called at all, but a collection of warm controversies on social questions." Thus wrote Mr. Frederic Harrison, in the *Fortnightly Review* of June, 1865.

§ 4. What was true at that time is even more true now, for during the intervening years many of the theories then current

have been modified, others have been completely abandoned, and consequently the conclusions based upon them have been altogether discarded. Mr. Francis D. Longe, in 1866, and subsequently Mr. Thornton, in 1869, so effectually demolished the wage-fund theory, that Mr. John Stuart Mill gave it up as untenable; whilst Mr. Harrison has thrown so much discredit upon the favourite maxim of supply and demand as usually expounded, that it requires considerable hardihood on the part of public writers to reproduce it in its original nude state, without some kind of decent clothing so as to avoid shocking the sensibility of those who have a modicum of faith still left in the higher attributes of human nature.

§ 5. The glibness with which some writers and talkers treat this subject in its relation to labour, the air of infinite wisdom which they assume, and the overweening confidence with which they propound their crude notions, would be ludicrous, were it not for the mischievous consequences which too often result from their absurd blunders and false theories. The effects of such erroneous doctrines are disastrous to those who are misled by them, for many persons are too ignorant to detect the gross errors which underlie the fallacies in the very plausible utterances here referred to, and therefore they act upon them as though they were gospel truths. Mr. Harrison, in the article above quoted, very clearly pointed out that the wisest and greatest of our economical writers base many of their conclusions on a theory of political society which they themselves have worked out, and to accept the one without the other is a folly which only spurious economists and ill-informed writers would be guilty of. He further says that many of the so-called laws of political economy are only partially true, that they may be applicable under certain circumstances and given conditions, but that even then we must be quite sure that all the facts are accurately noted and stated, or else we shall be blundering and groping in the dark, like a blind man among the tombs.

§ 6. What we have here to deal with is political economy as applied to industry and profits, to production and distribution, and at the very threshold we are met by confusion and want of accurate definition. It is not so easy, as some superficial writers

imagine, to define absolutely the objects and scope of their favourite science. If we examine the several treatises which have been published from the time of Adam Smith down to the year 1890, we shall find that a great variety of subjects are discussed having more or less reference to the theory of Government as a whole, only that some of these writers avoid certain matters, which others, as for instance Mr. Mill, include, as having a direct bearing on the questions of production, distribution, and value, as forming part of the economy of Government.

§ 7. Great differences of opinion seem to exist as to the precise meaning of the "science" itself, and as to the subjects which it professes to teach. Mr. McLeod says that it is "the science of the laws which regulate the exchangeable relations of quantities;" while Archbishop Whately defines it as "the science of values;" Mr. Mill objects that, in the latter definition, the consideration of value regards the *distribution* of wealth too exclusively of its *production*.

§ 8. In the preface to a recent edition of Mr. Malthus's "Definitions in Political Economy" occurs the following: "The questions which the science of political economy embraces may for the most part be ranged under two separate heads—the one of them relating to the interchange of commodities, or the proportion in which they exchange for each other; and the other to their distribution, or the proportion in which they are divided into the three several groups of wages, rent, and profits, which form the primary revenues of mankind, from which all other revenues are either mediately or immediately derived." This writer does not appear to understand that the question which precedes both interchange and distribution is production, without which neither of the others could exist. If political economists could once settle the laws and values attaching to production, exchange and distribution could then be much more easily defined and explained.

§ 9. The following definition by Mr. John Stuart Mill is much more comprehensive: "Writers on political economy profess to teach, or to investigate, the nature of wealth, and the laws of its production and distribution; including directly or remotely, the operation of all the causes by which the condition

of mankind, or of any society of human beings, in respect of this universal object of human desire, is made prosperous or the reverse." It will be seen that the aspirations and objects of human desire, the motives and incentives to human action, are embraced within the scope and compass of Mr. Mill's definition. Now these are in themselves variable, and they vary considerably according to circumstances and the state of society, political and other events; and also by those causes which are purely industrial and social, all of which profoundly affect and influence men, both as regards production and distribution. Consequently the whole of these causes will affect the application of economic laws, and all theories respecting "wealth."

§ 10. The definition of the very first term employed by political economists to denote the object of their investigations —namely, wealth, is scarcely settled in a manner sufficiently definite for scientific treatment, although in a general sense it is clear enough for all practical purposes. Mr. Malthus thus defines the term wealth: "The material objects necessary, useful, or agreeable to man, which have required some portion of human exertion to appropriate or produce." Mr. Mill says that wealth means "all useful or agreeable things which possess exchangeable value." Exchangeable value, according to Mr. Mill, is thus made not only an attribute of wealth, but its very essence, the absolute condition of its existence; and yet it seems tolerably evident that it is not the sole condition, but one only of several, and that although perhaps its chief characteristic, other and very important elements may coexist along with it, and form a distinct feature in its composition. The exchangeable value of a book, a picture, a piece of sculpture, a public building, or other works of art, is not the sole measure of its value, even in the sense of wealth, for it has an intrinsic and extrinsic value of its own, apart from the price it would fetch in the market, which is its exchangeable value. So it is also of inventions and many other things.

§ 11. The sources of wealth are stated by Mr. Malthus to be "land, labour, and capital. The two original sources are land and labour, but the aid which labour receives from capital is applied so early, and is so very necessary in the production of

wealth, that it may be considered as a third source." In a certain sense all this may be and is true; but the description is hardly accurate enough for a scientific treatise, in which the laws of a science are expounded and applied. The resources of Nature, or material agents, are the sources of wealth; labour is the means by which they are utilised and made productive; capital is the accumulated results of this labour, over and above that which is required for immediate consumption.

§ 12. Nature, the "bountiful mother of us all," is the source of all wealth—in some places she is profuse in her supplies, in other places she is niggardly in the extreme; in some parts of the world land produces in abundance with very little labour, in other parts great skill, toil, and capital are required in order to make it produce anything at all. So it is with animal life; in some countries it is reproduced with excessive rapidity; the fowls of the air and animals on land are plentiful for food, while the ever-flowing sea, and its tributaries, the rivers which flow into it, yield a supply of fish which is almost inexhaustible. Insects are a means whereby plants are fertilised and varieties produced, and in some cases even of accumulating food for the use of man, as, for instance, bees, which collect and deposit their honey. Electricity and light are now as much sources of wealth as land and water, inasmuch as by mechanical appliances they are made to serve the purposes of man, and to yield a profitable return for the skill, labour, and capital employed in utilising these forces of Nature, making them subservient to and under the control of the worker, and effective for present and future use. To quote Mr. Mill, "Nature, however, does more than supply materials, she also supplies powers. The matter of the globe is not an inert recipient of forms and properties impressed by human hands; it has active energies by which it co-operates with, and may even be used as a substitute for, labour."

§ 13. By labour these natural agents are multiplied, extended, and developed—that which was wild is cultivated, domesticated, and stored. Nature is no longer left to herself, for human intelligence is brought to bear on her apparently capricious wealth-producing capabilities, and that which was

formerly, to all appearances, strangely spasmodic is now made permanently recurrent; where originally there were alternations of abundance and of scarcity, there is now a perpetual supply, certain and regular; or if this cannot in all cases be effected, the superabundance of one year is stored for the use of the succeeding one, so that the waste of Nature is made to become the wealth of the human race. By acquiring an accurate knowledge of the laws of Nature we are able to avoid to a great extent the inconveniences arising from dearths and droughts; the lack of moisture is provided for by irrigation; and floods which, if left to themselves, would desolate and destroy, are confined within proper bounds; by the use of channels or canals they become a means of transport, and are converted into substantial benefits for commercial and trading purposes. The causes which have a tendency from time to time to destroy animal and vegetable life are all accurately noted, and means are used to prevent the ravages, which otherwise would result from the neglect of precautions, being to any great extent disastrous; while at the same time the breeds of the former and the produce of the latter are permanently improved. All this and more is done by labour, so that although labour may not be economically, in a technical sense, a source of wealth, it is certainly the active means by which it is produced, accumulated, and rendered available. In point of fact, labour is the great agent in production—it is the cause of wealth, as well as the means by which it is created.

§ 14. The wealth of a country consists not only in the accumulated stores of produce which may be of an exchangeable value, but also of the natural resources which are capable of being developed and made productive, whether in the present or in the future; it embraces all those natural agents which may be utilised and turned to account, and also the labour by which these may be made productive and reproductive, and thereby add to the available means of subsistence of a nation. Hence human skill and labour are but dormant wealth, just as much as the minerals that are still under the surface, or the land that remains barren for want of cultivation.

§ 15. Capital is that portion of the product of human agency

which is available for present and future use in making reproductive that which is stored by human labour. It may be represented by stock, plant, or money, all of which are convertible for the purposes of further production. But there is still another element which is, to all intents and purposes, capital—namely, credit, for a good name is often equivalent to the largest capital. Without capital, labour would be slow, if not paralysed; without labour, capital would be so much unproductive waste. Labour is often looked upon as a mere agent in production, whereas it is the active force; capital is its handmaid —a good servant, but too frequently a bad master.

§ 16. Labour has been defined by Mr. Malthus as "the exertions of human beings employed with a view to remuneration." Mr. Mill goes further, and says that "Labour is either bodily or mental, or to express the distinction more comprehensively, either muscular or nervous; and it is necessary to include in the idea not solely the exertion itself, but all feelings of a disagreeable kind, all bodily inconvenience or mental annoyance, connected with the employment of one's thoughts, or muscles, or both, in a partial occupation." Surely this is the lowest possible view of labour. If it be true, then, as a natural consequence, labour must be degrading, not ennobling; and therefore no one need feel surprised if the workman cease to take a pride in that which is disagreeable and annoying, and only does it with the one aim—namely, of screwing out of the employer the largest possible amount, in the shape of wages, for the least possible quantity of work, in the shape of labour. This is the natural conclusion from such teaching, and it has already produced a plentiful crop of baneful results.

§ 17. In trying to ascertain the relative position which capital and labour bear to each other, we must define the meaning of those terms, and discover the exact relationship which ought to exist between them. Labour and capital are not commodities in the ordinary sense in which that term is employed, for labour is the creator of commodities, and capital provides the means of subsistence during their manufacture, and also the market wherein they may be bought, sold, or exchanged. A commodity is the product of labour, or of labour and capital

combined; it is a something which can be bought, sold, or exchanged—that is, transferred from one person to another. Labour, as such, cannot be thus transferred. The time and skill of the labourer may be given in exchange for so much wages, in money or in kind, but it is the product of the worker which is bought, not the worker; that which he has produced can be valued and paid for in cash, but the same thing can be again reproduced in equal, varying, or augmented quantities for another customer, on the following or succeeding days. The raw materials with which the labourer works are commodities, so are the things manufactured by his skill and labour; but the producer is the same, always the same. A piano is a commodity, but the sounds it emits under the hands of a skilful performer could scarcely be called a commodity, for they cannot be economically transferred to another, although the music may in a sense be purchased by those who attend the performance, and listen to its strains.

§ 18. Mr. Frederic Harrison justly observes that "there are three grand features in which *labour* differs from a *commodity*. Firstly, every seller of wares, even a hawker, has by the hypothesis a *stock*, a realised store, a portable visible thing—a commodity. In the second place, in most cases the seller of a commodity can send it, or carry it about, from place to place and market to market, with perfect ease. He need not be on the spot, he generally can send a sample, he usually treats by correspondence. A merchant sits in his counting-house, and by a few letters and forms transports and distributes the subsistence of a whole city from continent to continent. In other cases—as the shopkeeper—the ebb and flow of passing multitudes supply the locomotion for him. This is the true market. Here competition acts rapidly, fully, simply, and fairly. It is totally otherwise with a day labourer, who has no commodity to sell. He must be himself present at every market—which means costly personal locomotion. He cannot correspond with his employer; he cannot send a sample of his strength; nor do employers knock at his cottage door. This is not a market. In a word, there is no real market, no true scale of a commodity, where vendor and wares are one and the same, and that one a man, totally without resources or provisions for

himself, with the wants of a citizen and a family at home. There never was but one true labour market, and that was where a slave was sold like a chattel; but here it is not with the slaves that the bargain is made, but with the trader who owns them, as is the case with the owner of horses or cattle. Thirdly (and this is the important point), the labourer has not got a commodity to sell, because what he seeks to do is not to exchange products, but to combine to produce. When a buyer and seller meet, in market or out, the bargain is made, the price is paid, the goods change hands, they part—the contract is complete, the transaction ends. Even where, as in complex dealings, the bargain is prolonged, it is a dealing in specific goods. It is not the formation of a continuous relation which, for the workman at least, absorbs and determines his whole life. If the trader fails to do business with one customer, he turns to another. The business over, he leaves him perhaps for ever. In any case, the contract is a contract for the sale (*i.e.* simple transfer) of one specific thing. How totally different is this from the relations of employer and employed! This is permanent, or rather continuous; it involves the entire existence of one at least; it implies sustained co-operation. This is no contract to sell something, it is a contract to do something, it is a contract of partnership or joint activity, it is an association involving every side of life. Nothing is more fallacious than to call labour questions simply a matter of wages or money. It would be as right to speak of every trader needing a partner, every woman ready for marriage, every applicant for a post of trust, as having a commodity to sell. The engagement of a workman for hire is an instance of a voluntary combination of energies and capacities. The union of capitalist and labourers is, in the highest sense, a partnership involving a real equality of duties and powers—they finding the strength, the patience, the manual skill, the physical exertion; he finding the management, the machinery, the immediate means of subsistence, and, by rights, the protection of all kind. He and they are as necessary to each other as men in any relation of life. They can affect each other as intimately for good and for bad as any partners whatever. The dignity of their work and lives

rests in their knowing and performing their mutual duties and their common tasks. Applied to this noble and intimate relation of life—this grand institution of society—the language of the market or of barter is a cruel and senseless cant." Noble words these, Mr. Harrison! and they contain the kernel of the whole question.

§ 19. Labour, as defined by Mr. Malthus, is inexact, inasmuch as it is not necessary that it should be "employed" in the sense in which he has used that term, much less that it be employed with a view to "remuneration." Labour may be defined as the act of "production," which, in its turn, may be said to be "the creation of objects which constitute wealth," and the produce of labour is "the portion of wealth created by production." But obviously these fall short of a full and true definition, for many things are produced by labour which do not constitute wealth in the sense in which the term is used by Mr. Mill, and hence he and others have contended that the word "utility" should be introduced with a view to qualify "objects" in their relation to wealth. But even "utility" is not the sole measure of value, for beauty in design, and finish in workmanship, is an important element of consideration, above and beyond mere utility. The term labour as used by economists is often circumscribed and narrow; it does not always mean industry; for this "term generally implies more superintendence and less bodily exertion than labour; and it does not merely mean occupation." But for present purposes we will use the term labour as meaning "that bodily, or mental exertion, or both combined, which is brought into exercise or is employed with a view to remuneration." In this sense the one great object of labour is pay, in the shape of wages, and it is here that the greatest possible divergence will be found in the views expressed by political economists, both as to value and price. Those who insist that labour is a commodity must remember that it is the man or the trader owning the commodity who, according to usage and custom, has the right to fix its price, and the conditions of its sale. In all cases, except labour, it is the seller not the purchaser who fixes the price for the article, but in the case of labour the purchaser or employer assumes the

right to fix the price and enforce conditions. Slowly and by degrees the workmen have been learning that they have the right to fix the price for their labour: this is one of the lessons which they have been taught by the "science" which is continually dinned into their ears, and no sooner do they begin to see the value of the weapon put into their hands, and the use to which it can be turned for their own advantage, than the expounders of the science turn round upon them and denounce their arrogance in assuming to dictate to employers what wages they shall give, or the terms upon which they will consent to be employed. If labour be a commodity, the seller of it has the sole right of fixing its price, and employers must accept in full the obvious results of their own persistent teaching. As a matter of fact the seller is not absolutely able to fix the price, or settle the conditions of sale; the terms are the result of bargaining, both parties being more or less equally placed. Capital and labour should occupy relatively the same equal ground.

§ 20. Political economists have not yet succeeded in fixing the basis of the prices of commodities. In a rough and ready kind of way they speak of the "cost of production." Now the cost of production may mean one thing, or it might mean several things in combination. Yet no sufficient definition is given as to what is included or excluded. The cost of production, speaking broadly, includes cost of raw materials, of labour, of supervision, and of the capital and plant necessary for production, of transit in various forms, sometimes limited to the place of production, at other times to the place of sale of the commodity after production is completed. Of course, every item, and every element of expenditure which go to make up the total cost of the article, must be considered in fixing the price of commodities. Nevertheless there ought to be some basis of estimate or calculation, and it certainly ought not to be profits. Wages might not in all cases be the one sole and safe basis for the computation of cost, but it is always an important item, and it ought to be recognised in an exceptional way in economical science. Not because it constitutes the chief item in amount, sometimes it is infinitesimal as compared with other

items, but because it represents human labour, thought, and skill, and it ought not to be the one selected item, as it often is, for reductions when the total cost of production is regarded as being too high.

This is indeed the fatal policy which has led to no end of mischief in the industrial world; and it is precisely the policy which political economists have inculcated, or which at least has been evolved out of their teachings. If the cost of labour in the totality of production can be diminished by improved machinery and labour-saving appliances, by greater dexterity and skill on the part of the workers, by division of labour, or by similar means, then the lessened cost will probably be of advantage to the community, and to the producers as part of the community. If, however, the labourer is starved, or is pinched to such a degree as to lessen his purchasing power, then consumption itself is immediately checked by reason of fewer purchases, or by a proportionate decrease in the quantity purchased and consumed. In the end, this policy will not be conducive to the "wealth of nations," any more than it is to the wealth of the individuals concerned; because cheaper production thus obtained is at the expense of the producing consumer, and consequently is not to his advantage. This class constitutes the mass of the people, to whom lower wages mean absolute privation in the majority of cases, not merely the deprivation of the comforts of life, but of the essential necessaries—wholesome and enough of food, warm clothing, decent homes, and fuel for their dwellings. Wages should therefore be attacked last of all, when diminution of cost is sought, and not in the first instance as is commonly the case in almost every industry.

§ 21. In estimating the value of labour no doubt much the same means must be used as in estimating the value of commodities, such, for instance, as its varying quantity and quality, and also its mediate and immediate uses. But other considerations have to be taken into account beyond the mere present means of subsistence; provision must be made for sickness, accidents, old age, family necessities, and the contingencies of out of work. Labour cannot, as a rule, be stored, except in isolated instances as, for example, where an employer retains

the services of a skilled workman, although there is no work to be done, because he could not easily replace that special skill when required, if once he allowed the workman to migrate elsewhere in search of employment. These cases are, however, singularly rare, and do not affect the general question, or narrow its application.

§ 22. In fixing the price of commodities the first thing really to be done is to calculate the cost of production—materials and labour; this is the only true basis of price, and upon this all other conditions must rest; next in importance is the cost of distribution, including transit and all other charges incidental thereto; and lastly, should come profits, including cost of plant and machinery, interest on capital, losses in trade, and all other items for which the employer is liable. If the cost of production be too great, mechanical appliances, the division of labour, and the economical use of raw material must be studied and applied; if the cost of distribution be too great, economy in management and transit should be enforced; but it is neither reasonable nor right that excessive reductions should be continually made in wages for the purpose of keeping up profits, or of paying the exorbitant interest for accommodation which in too many instances is paid, or at least promised, for loans.

§ 23. Competition is of great use in regulating the prices of commodities, and in preventing the growth of monopolies, but it is seldom that it is so absolutely unrestrictive as many even well-informed persons imagine. Adam Smith, with that clear insight and accurate knowledge of life which he so eminently possessed, pointed out that combinations among masters, either directly or tacitly, enabled them to fix the price of labour or to regulate it. At the present time the price of iron, coal, corn, cloth, cotton goods, and, indeed, almost every conceivable commodity is more or less fixed by the great traders who not unfrequently "rig the market" to suit their own purposes, just as the "bulls" and "bears" on "Change" manipulate the share market, running the prices of securities up and down with a nimbleness which is perfectly astounding and too often ruinous. Even the money market is subject to similar fluctuations: the

price of money (not its value) being determined by the directors of the Bank of England in a way not easily understood by the general public; the current rates are advanced or they recede like the ebb and flow of the tide; the effect is seen, but not the manipulation; the result is indicated by a barometer entirely their own, the reading of which is as incomprehensible as hieroglyphics, except to the initiated few.

§ 24. But "unlimited competition" has its dark side as well as its useful one, as any one can see by the eagerness with which traders endeavour to undersell each other. The methods adopted by some traders would scarcely commend themselves to the consciences of moralists, if they could only see the "tricks of trade" and the too often dishonest practices which are employed. Worthless goods are palmed off on the unwary, instead of those answering to the sample shown when the order is solicited; this shameful exchange is only discovered when it is too late to recover the money paid, or to obtain damages for the fraud committed. If a poor Whitechapel bird-catcher paints a sparrow, and sells it for a bullfinch, he is usually within easy distance of a police-court where the punishment is sharp, if not always short. But a "tradesman" is sometimes found guilty of painting the heads of nearly worthless, or at least inferior sheep, and passing them off as real Southdowns, and when detected, he is carpeted and summarily dismissed. Guns are manufactured and sold, whose great merit lies in the fact that they maim the shooter, but do not injure the person fired at. Shells are sold which will not explode—no great harm in that; but ships are built which only carry their living freight to a watery grave.*

§ 25. Much of the loss of trade in the markets of the world, so frequently deplored by English manufacturers, was due to the fact that they shipped worthless goods, mere shoddy, as though it were meant to show how English workmen could be taught to scamp their work, and at the same time gloss it

* Recent investigations have shown how "worthless weapons" are manufactured and sold; how leather is weighted by glucose; how "Sheffield blades" are produced; and how foreign watches are palmed off as real English levers. See Parliamentary Reports, 1887 to 1890.

over to make it appear of good British quality. The term "Brummagem" does not now merely apply to the great midland town of hardware and once radical notoriety, it applies equally to Sheffield goods, Lancashire cottons, Yorkshire woollens, and, indeed, to almost every kind and variety of manufactured goods, prepared specially for exportation. At home houses are "built to sell"; we are poisoned by adulteration, which even recent legislation has been quite unable to stop. But this is not all, the honest and upright trader is often undersold and ruined by the mere speculator and swindler, who buys on credit, lives on credit, sells the goods for less than their actual cost, and then—well, he cheats his creditors, passes through the bankruptcy court, pays a composition, and begins again with a fresh batch of victims and dupes. Honourable competition, like fair professional rivalry, is beneficial to trade, commerce, and industry; but where honour ends, and fraud begins, is but a step, and too many trespass beyond that fine-drawn line.

§ 26. Buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market is another of the laws of this science which has its good and its bad side. In order to obtain a profit the manufacturer must be able to sell at a price higher than the actual cost of production; but this axiom has more to do with the middleman, or trader, than with the manufacturer. A sharp buyer, with plenty of capital, will ever be on the alert for cheap bargains—these are plentiful enough, as persons are always to be found whose necessities compel them to "sell at a sacrifice" in order to meet the requirements of pressing creditors. There are also, be it remembered, "sharp" manufacturers, who manufacture only "bargains"—goods cheap and nasty, specially prepared for sale rooms, annual sales, and mock auctions. Here we have the principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market in full operation, without check or hindrance. But the worst phase of this practice was exhibited some years ago in the export trade to Australia, to the Cape Colony, and other places, where it was found that the goods delivered were absolutely worthless. The natural consequence of this spurious trading has been, of late years, to produce re-

action and depression, which have brought ruin upon manufacturers, traders, and shippers, and given a bad name to the country from which the wares were sent. The principles which underlie the expression buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market, in the hands of honest traders, are valuable as a means of indicating the difference between buying and selling by dealers, and the rules which should govern both. But one of the evils which sometimes arise from the too free use of such generalisations may be seen in the conduct of some workmen, who, accepting the doctrine in all its bareness, stripped of its proper qualifications, give the least possible labour for the highest wages which they can manage to exact from an employer. It is this absence of morality in contracts of which we complain, both in labour and in trade; and the laws of political economy do not supply us with any sufficient checks against the abuse of principles which are only useful when properly and honestly applied.

§ 27. With regard to the wages of labour, the usual doctrine of political economists is that wages, like prices, are governed by the laws of supply and demand; that these laws are natural laws; that they cannot be permanently set aside; that a rise of wages cannot be effected by artificial means, and that combinations and strikes cannot resist a falling market; in other words, that wages and prices are absolutely the result of laws and forces which cannot be overruled, and which are as resistless as physical laws. How far this is so will be seen subsequently. The laws of supply and demand undoubtedly exercise an influence upon the wages of labour, as they do unquestionably upon the prices of commodities, although not in the same ratio, inasmuch as many circumstances are in operation to influence the one, which do not at all affect the other. But even in the matter of commodities the laws of supply and demand are by no means absolute, as every manufacturer knows, for very frequently the supply precedes the demand, and, in fact, creates it; and even where this is not the case, the demand is stimulated by the supply to such an extent as to be nearly equal in force to the power which created it. If the theory put forward were true, as usually stated, the demand

should precede the supply, the latter being, in fact, merely the means of satisfying a want which had previously existed. The history of industry supplies us with plenty of examples which show that this is not at any time absolutely true, never more than partially true; evidence could be given in abundance in support of this view. Everywhere shrewd speculators strive to invent a want by stimulating a desire. Even when this is accomplished, the article is subject to conditions which materially affect the price—a monopoly, for instance. Take for example water: all persons require water, but do supply and demand fix the amount of the water rate? or is it some other supreme and all-powerful authority? It certainly is not competition, for generally there is none. So it is with the price of labour. There are causes, not always seen in operation, which affect the rate of wages in this or that place; sometimes they are altogether inexplicable, but whether seen or unseen they are felt in their full force, and are often almost irresistible. The laws of supply and demand, to have and to exercise all the power over prices and wages claimed for them by political economists, should be detached from all other influences; competition should be free, and unaccompanied by any restrictions. This is altogether impossible, and consequently there must be some defect in the theory, as commonly understood, which in effect prevents its being universally applicable.

§ 28. The limitation of supply is one of the fundamental principles of the science of political economy. It teaches this: whenever there is a "glut," or the market is overstocked, or when there is a cessation or a decrease in the demand for the article or articles, either cease to produce, or so diminish the production that the stock on hand shall not become burdensome by reason of its excessive quantity, or liable to loss through depreciation in value, or unremunerative, because the sale is so long deferred that it will not repay to capital a fair interest for being so long "locked up," instead of being convertible into cash, ready to be made reproductive or available for present use. And the doctrine is a reasonable one with regard to all commodities, inasmuch as a glutted market necessitates a sacrifice somewhere; moreover, almost all kinds of goods deteriorate in

value if they are too long in stock. The regulation of the supply has therefore an important bearing upon prices, sometimes even to the extent of being able to govern them, as manufacturers and traders well know. But limitation of supply does not always mean a limitation of the production, for in articles that are not perishable, or do not lose much by being kept in stock, the production is often continuous, and the stock is correspondingly increased; but the quantity sent to the markets is regulated by the price which it will command at ready sales, or it is withheld in order to ensure the price desired. There might even be the same demand, that is, in the sense of being required for use by the consumer, but in consequence of other circumstances the intended purchasers cannot, or will not, pay the price fixed by the seller. The articles are then practically withdrawn from the market, until other bidders are prepared to pay the higher price demanded by the dealers. The real object here sought is to maintain a price below which the dealer will not sell, or it may be to obtain a higher price than that for which the article was previously sold. All this is reasonable enough up to a given point, but sometimes dealers form themselves into what is called a "ring," and then they are absolutely able to "rig" and rule the markets. This was eminently the case with the "coal ring" a few years since, when coal was advanced to almost starvation prices. The cotton "corner" in Liverpool, in 1889, was able to paralyse the cotton trades of Lancashire for a time, by its power of withholding supplies except at prices ruinous to manufacturers.

§ 29. If it be right to limit the supply of one commodity, why not of another? If labour be a commodity, as the economists say, why should not the workmen also limit the supply of their labour, either by withdrawing the surplus hands out of the market, or by working less hours, and thereby giving others a chance of sharing the available amount of work, and consequently the wages offered by employers? And yet, whenever workmen seek to employ the principle of limitation of supply by acting upon it for themselves, they are denounced as though they had committed a crime, whereas they are only adapting themselves to the laws and teachings of political economy.

§ 30. If the supply of anything be in excess of the demand for it, common sense would seem to say, "Reduce the quantity, unless, indeed, you can afford to lay in a store for future use with a certainty that the demand will revive, or that it is not permanently but only temporarily diminished." This is clearly the law as taught by political economists to working men; but when these strive to put it in practice, by limiting the supply of their own labour, which they are told is a commodity, and subject to the same rules as other commodities, they are then gravely informed that the principle is vicious, unsound, and inapplicable. Who can forget the terrible outcry against the miners for their alleged attempt to limit the output of coal? In whom did they find a defender? Either the law is sound and general in its application, or it is partial in its operation and unsound as a universal principle. There cannot be one set of economical axioms for the capitalists and another set for the workmen, and still another set for the dealers or distributors. The fact is, the theory of supply and demand is only partially true, and is subject to many modifications according to circumstances, and therefore it does not constitute an immutable law of an exact science.

§ 31. *Over-Population.*—In order to remedy the state of things complained of, and to prevent a constantly recurring glut of commodities, or a scarcity of employment, or, in other words, a surplus of labour in proportion to the demand for labourers, some political economists, nay, most of them since the time of Mr. Malthus, have suggested various checks to population. Some of those advocated are good and reasonable, such as abstention from early marriages, self-restraint and continence on the part of both men and women. Other writers, on the contrary, have propounded theories and promulgated views which are as repugnant to the principles of physiological science, as they are repulsive to morals, and dangerous to the physical and social well-being of young persons, and particularly to those of the gentler sex. If political economy can do nothing better than suggest checks to population, as a means of balancing supply and demand in its application to labour, the sooner its professors seek some other occupation the better; especially will

it be so for those who, believing in their nostrums, may seek to apply their devices and contrivances in actual life as a panacea for the social evils under which they groan and suffer.

§ 32. *Destruction of Machinery.* — In the earlier labour struggles of this country, when the use of machinery was first introduced, the poor half-starved workpeople looked upon the relentless machine as a monster of cruelty, the invention of an evil spirit, whose object it was to crush still further the helpless and hapless toilers in their struggle for a bare subsistence. And what wonder? How could they see into the far future, and forecast the untold blessings which this newly discovered power would confer on the human race? They could only see the present, feel the pangs of hunger, and curse the machine which deprived them of the means of procuring bread. Machinery at the outset has, in numberless instances, been the immediate cause of reducing to poverty those who were dependent from day to day on the labour of their hands. Hence we find in the records of the past ample evidence that there existed an intense aversion to the employment of machines, and that the half-starved people sought to avenge themselves upon the employers by destroying the newly invented machinery. Sad work this, foolish too; but was there no reason, no excuse? Others have opposed the progress of scientific discovery with not one iota of the excuse, or sense of wrong, which stung these poor people into resistance. All classes and all sections have in their time been guilty of similar absurdities, and even crimes, when some hitherto hidden principles have been discovered and applied, which, to their imaginations, appeared to be in opposition to their own cherished theories. In the annals of industry, science, art, government, religion, and philosophy, there are many dark chapters which tell of martyrdoms, of suffering, of persecution, of absolute devastation caused by ignorant people against new discoveries. Even in "Liberal Birmingham" Dr. Priestley's library was destroyed, and his home burnt, because he held opinions heterodox to the orthodoxy of the place. History is full of examples of resistance to progress, social, political, and scientific, in which not only the uninformed masses have taken part, but also the educated, "the

enlightened," and the wealthy, especially when what was called their "interests" was attacked. It is indeed doubtful if even the destruction of machinery by an infuriated mob, bad as it was, is more to be deprecated than some of the economical theories which have from time to time been advocated—such, for instance, as the special methods for checking the increase of population which have been proposed; both parties profess to have the same end in view, but they are equally opposed to the principles of morals and to the common weal.

§ 33. In later times other and far better plans have been adopted by working men, the most important being shortening the hours of labour, thereby taking advantage of the increase of production, caused by the use of machinery, and the division of labour. The employers, in order to effect a limitation of supply, blow out their furnaces, or in mills, run short time, the object in both cases being the same. If production, or, in other words, supply, is more than equal to the demand, common sense would seem to point to the necessity of reducing the number of working hours in order to equalise the product of labour with the demand for such products. If by the use of machinery a supply of commodities can be produced in six hours equal to what was before produced in ten, and at the same time more than sufficient to satisfy the demand, why keep the machinery running for ten hours and thereby effect a glut? When scientific invention is used as a means of improving the condition of the people, it will be a blessing indeed; and what worthier object can it have than that of giving more leisure to the worker, and at the same time extending the facilities for its proper enjoyment?

§ 34. *The Wage-Fund Theory.*—Perhaps no single doctrine has been more persistently or mischievously urged by political economists, against the claims of the working classes, than the dogmatic assumption that there is a certain wage-fund, which constitutes a definite portion of the existing wealth of the country for the payment of wages, and that this amount will be wholly used for that purpose, and that not one penny more can be so used. If this were true, then the rate of wages must depend on the number of persons employed; and this is the conclusion so emphatically urged by those who are ever the opponents of

the wage-earning classes. In conformity with this view economic writers declare that every effort to raise wages on the part of any one section of workmen, if successful, will but reduce the wages of some other section of the industrial classes; or if this be found to be impossible, the number of hands will be reduced, so as to square the amount to be paid, to the wage-fund supply. The term "wage-fund" is at best but a figure of speech to denote the amount of capital at any one moment available for the purposes of employment, and this amount is subject to variation and fluctuation to an almost unlimited extent. It never has been and never can be a principle capable of being formulated into a "law," exact in its operation and universal in its application. But, notwithstanding this, the doctrine was continually reasserted, and the most extravagant conclusions were based upon this utterly foundationless maxim. More recently this theory has nearly dropped out of economical discussions.

§ 35. Wages are paid out of the product of labour; capital, where necessary, advances the amount until it has realised a return; the measure of wages, therefore, is equal to the entire product of labour. Wages may absorb the whole amount of that product, in which case capital would not realise profit, and production would consequently decrease; but it would not, and could not, in all cases cease. If the wage-fund theory be correct, it must be true of all times and under all circumstances; but history and life-experience alike prove the contrary. Plenty of cases have occurred, and still occur, where workmen and employers have waited and do wait until the return is sufficient to recoup the one for his wages, the other for his profits. Wages are not universally paid out of capital even now, for the employer is frequently able to realise on production before the wages of the workmen become due; such, for instance, as where the articles produced on the first two days of the week are sold before the week end, when the wages of the worker are usually paid. In some cases wages are only paid by the month or quarter, in which case the "wage-fund" actually forms the working capital of the employer. The expression might be right enough in a limited sense—where, for instance, it is used to represent the actual amount which a manufacturer may have in

hand after paying for plant, machinery, raw materials, and other necessary items in commencing trade. The surplus is then his stock-in-trade with which to pay for the labour required in order to produce the completed articles ready for sale. The theory of a wage-fund is now discarded by the best-informed writers; although it is occasionally reasserted, with certain qualifications, by unpractical men. The flaw in the hypothesis, and its untenableness as an economic maxim, was first pointed out by the present writer in 1860, in a speech in St. Martin's Hall; in 1866 Mr. Francis D. Longe attacked it vigorously as unsound in principle and false in its application; in 1867 and 1869 Mr. Thornton laid siege to the citadel and carried it by assault; in 1869 Mr. John Stuart Mill, who was then its ablest defender, capitulated, and formally recanted his previous teachings on this doctrine; and in 1874–5 General F. A. Walker, of the United States, completely demolished the fortress, and stamped the theory as an economical heresy.

§ 36. *Wages.*—"The wages of labour is the remuneration paid to the labourer for his exertions." These are divided by political economists into "nominal wages"—that is, "the wages which the labourer receives in the current money of the country"—and "real wages," or "the necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries of life which the wages of the labourer enable him to command." One or the other therefore represents the actual payment, in money and in kind, for the labour performed, or the remuneration which the workman receives for his services. The rate of wages means "the ordinary wages paid to the labourer by the day, week, month, or year, according to the custom of the place where he is employed." This is generally estimated in money and in actual money value, as where house-rent, coal, in some cases "board," or other things are included as part payment—this is what is meant by "paying in kind."

§ 37. According to the above definitions of the "masters of the science," the practical test with regard to wages is what it will command in the shape of "the necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries of life." This is the "real wages" of political economy. It requires but a very superficial acquaintance with the facts of actual life to be able to discover that a large

proportion of "labourers" never realise wages at all in this sense, for they are not able to command the "necessaries" of life, to say nothing of its conveniences, and almost less than nothing of its luxuries.

§ 38. There are many questions in connection with this part of the subject which it is necessary to discuss in detail, with especial reference to the action of trade unions, inasmuch as a great deal of misapprehension exists with regard to what they really attempt to do in the matter of the regulation of the wages of labour, more particularly as to the wages of those who belong to these unions as members, and relatively as to those who, although not belonging to the unions, work at the same trade, and are consequently affected by whatever arrangements are made, through their organisations, with capital, as represented by employers. Whatever political economists may say to the contrary, wages are not governed by natural and immutable laws. The rise in wages, their fluctuations, and the methods of payment, are the result of influences quite other than those given in the text-books of this so-called science; and, moreover, the laws of supply and demand have much less to do with the question of wages than is generally supposed by economical writers.

§ 39. Before, however, we discuss the laws which regulate, or at least affect, the wages of the labourer, it will be well to ascertain accurately and precisely what trade unions attempt to do in relation to wages. But first let us state what they do not attempt to do. They do not attempt to fix a maximum wage, or the highest wages which shall be paid for skilled labour in any department of trade. This, indeed, is what the masters endeavour to do, always with a sliding scale tending downwards, until they come to the lowest possible point, which the necessities of the labourer compel him to accept, in order to ward off a worse calamity.

§ 40. Trade unions do not attempt to fix or enforce uniformity of wages for all workmen in any particular branch of trade. Not only do they not try to do this generally, in so far as it affects the entire country, but they do not attempt to do so in any particular place or locality. If we examine into the

current rates of wages paid in some of the highest, the most skilled, and the best organised trades in the country, those having the most compact and powerful combinations, the greatest wealth, and the widest possible influence, we shall find that the rates paid vary very much more than most persons imagine, or even than those who are best acquainted with the facts of industrial life, appear to understand. Take for example the following trades: the wages paid to engineers, members of the Amalgamated Society, the largest and wealthiest trade union, varied throughout the country in 1877 from about 25*s.* to 45*s.* per week; in 1889 the minimum average ranged from 26*s.* to 38*s.* per week, while the maximum would reach to from 42*s.* to 45*s.* per week. In Lancashire in 1877 the average was about 32*s.*; in Yorkshire it was less; on the Tyne the minimum rate was 29*s.*; on the Wear, only twelve miles further south, the minimum was 33*s.* In London the wages varied from 36*s.* to 45*s.* per week; in some instances they might have been less, in exceptional cases they would be even higher. The rates of wages paid to ironfounders varied still more, although they are better organised than most trades; the prices accepted by the members of this society, under the sanction of their own rules, are so numerous that it would require a tabulated statement to enumerate them; in one town alone they vary from 24*s.* to 45*s.* per week. In the building trades there is a greater tendency to uniformity than there is in most other trades; but among carpenters, notwithstanding the excellence of their organisation, there is a difference amounting to from 5*s.* to even 7*s.* per week. In a table published by the General Union the rates of wages varied from 21*s.* 6*d.* per week, in Lichfield, to £2, in the London district. Among the masons there is absolutely no uniformity, although the minimum is generally fixed by the custom of the town, as well as by the rules of the trade.* Whatever tendency there is towards uniformity in rates

* In 1888, according to the report of the Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade, the rates of wages varied in different towns almost as much as they did in 1877, although in most instances the minimum rates were somewhat higher. The wages of bricklayers ranged from 24*s.* per week in Lynn, to £2 2*s.* 4½*d.* in the London district. Carpenters' wages from £1 in Penzance, to £2 2*s.* 4½*d.* in London. In Scotland

of wages, arises from the fact that there are two opposing forces always at work; first, the efforts of the employers are at all times directed to the fixing of a maximum rate, above which they strive not to advance; on the other hand, the workmen always endeavour to fix a minimum rate, below which the ordinarily skilled craftsmen in the trade shall not accept employment, or at least not those who are members of the union.

§ 41. This is precisely what the unions attempt to do: They say that their labour in the particular trade, and for the locality, is worth so much per day or per hour, as the case may be; they contend that this is the general rate which, according to the prices paid for the articles produced, the employers can afford to give to the workpeople; or that it is the lowest rate at which they can live decently by their labour, as in fact they ought to live; or, taking into account the time spent in learning the trade, as being sufficiently remunerative for the skill required in the special work to be performed, and which, therefore, they are justified in accepting, when the whole circumstances of the trade and the locality are taken into account. Hence it is that they strive to fix a minimum rate below which workmen in the union shall not work. This minimum rate the employers endeavour to convert into a maximum; from the operation of these two causes combined, there is usually a tendency to a uniform rate; the result being that this rate is quoted as the average wages of the district. As a consequence of this antagonism between the two opposing parties, the average rate becomes the standard rate for the trade in this or that locality. This is confounded with uniformity, and is deemed by some to be a general fixed rate for all men, in any one district, whatever their degree of skill or deftness at the trade, and they contend that this approximate uniformity is caused by the action of trade unions. As well say that it is caused by employers, or

the rates varied even more. Painters' wages varied from 6½*d.* to 8½*d.* per hour. Masons' wages from 5½*d.* to 9*d.* per hour. Plumbers' from £1 5*s.* per week to £2 5*s.* per week. Cabinet-makers' wages from £1 4*s.* to £2 0*s.* 6*d.* There is no uniformity in wages, except that in the various localities a minimum rate is usually fixed, through the efforts of the union. The employers strive to make this the maximum in all cases. —See Labour Statistics, Third Report (c.-5808), 1889.

by the laws of political economy, for the latter has quite as much to do with the matter as trade unions.

§ 42. This ordinary or general rate of wages may be called the standard rate of wages of the district, or that which is usually paid by employers in any particular or given town or place, and hence may be called the market value or price, in so far as the term is a right one, of that special trade. What is called the average wage of a district, is the mean between the highest and lowest, taking the several rates and adding them together, and then dividing the total amount by the number of hands or wage recipients. An average rate of wages may also mean the amount per week, day, or hour which any man receives during the year, when the sum total of his earnings are given, and dividing them by the number of weeks, days, or hours, as the case may be. But this has very little to do with the rate of wages, in so far as helping us to determine its value or market price, but it leads us to another and a very important element in connection with the condition of the workman, and the real value of his wages, or that which it will command in "the necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries of life."

§ 43. Fluctuations in wages are evils to be guarded against, not only by the workmen, but also by the employer; to the former they are fraught with many serious consequences; when trade is good they live up to the full complement of their earnings; and when trade is bad they are soon found to be nearly destitute, for the simple reason that, in the mass, the working classes are not sufficiently thrifty to provide for the contingencies of out of work. Hence, when depression comes, and with it low wages, or what is worse, none at all, it brings in its train great distress and suffering, oftentimes pauperism, and not unfrequently crime. On this point the following observations are pertinent and valuable. Mr. Higgin, Q.C., in charging the Grand Jury, at the Preston Sessions, on February 21, 1877, said "it was unfortunately the fact that there was, and had been for some time back, a considerable increase of crime in Lancashire. There were various speculations as to the cause of this, but his opinion was, that as the amount of wages of the people increased, so did crime propor-

tionately decrease." This is the conclusion of an independent witness, and therefore all the more valuable. The statistics of the Poor Law Board are conclusive with regard to the increase of pauperism, and need no comment.

§ 44. In many cases the only, and in others the chief resource of the workman during times of depression is the out-of-work fund, or as it is called by some the "donation," or "benevolent" fund, of the trade union. During the ten years ending 1877, four societies alone paid to their unemployed members the enormous sum of £614,401, while in the following ten years, ending 1887, these same unions paid the astounding amount of £1,437,437 to members out of work.* Other unions also pay similarly high rates in support of those out of work, thus heavily taxing the wages of those in work, in addition to the compulsorily exacted poor-rate of the district or parish in which they live.

§ 45. To the employers, the evils arising from the frequent fluctuations in wages are scarcely less important, although not so disastrous as to the men. Some of these difficulties occur in arranging contracts, many of which extend over a considerable period of time. If the cost of labour was nearly stationary, or only subject to occasional disturbances at distinct intervals of time, estimates for work could be made with tolerable accuracy, inasmuch as the cost of raw materials can be calculated long beforehand, as a stock can be laid in, or an agreement made to supply them at given prices over a lengthened period. It is important to both parties that the wages of labour shall not be subject to constant variations, and also that when they have been fixed at a minimum rate, that they shall not be disturbed, except as the result of cool deliberation, and mutual arrangement beforehand. If these arrangements are not made, if fluctuations in the rates of wages eventuate through sudden strikes by the men, or lock-outs by the masters, the calamity does not merely affect the two parties engaged in the contest, or the special trade in which the dispute exists, but it exercises a depressing influence on many others, most of whom are made to suffer in consequence. Where such disputes arise it will be

* See *ante*, ch. iii. § 19.

found that they are as often, at least, caused by attempts of employers to enforce a reduction in wages, as by efforts of workmen to secure an advance.

§ 46. If the science of political economy is to be of any practical value, its expounders ought to try and find out some means whereby these frequent fluctuations can be avoided, instead of which they only teach men how to increase them by declaring that wages must inevitably depend on the variations of "the market," which may change several times a day, in so far as the price of the commodities offered for sale is concerned. Stocks and securities "go up and down" like the notes on a gamut, and in the hands of skilful operators they play strange music, which should make good men feel sad indeed.

§ 47. By whom, and what, is the price of labour determined? This is the kernel of the whole question; upon the answer, very much of the present and future welfare of the working classes depends; especially as to how they may interpret, use, or abuse the teachings of a science, whose laws have too often been turned to account for their disadvantage. From what has been before stated it is evident that the workmen, in accordance with economical laws, have the right of fixing the price of their own labour; the masters have simply the right of refusal to employ. But there are many circumstances in connection with these bargains which do not occur in relation to marketable commodities, especially that labour cannot be stored, it must be used now, always in the present, the masters may be able to wait, the workmen cannot, or at least, cannot except by means of combination, and union funds. It is therefore desirable, nay advisable, on every ground, moral and economical, that both parties to the contract should mutually arrange and fix all the terms and conditions of labour for definite periods, long or short, subject in all cases to renewal, on proper notice being given on either side. It is simply a matter of free contract between the seller of labour—the workman, and the buyer of labour—the employer, and bargaining ought in this case to be as equitable as in any other.

§ 48. One of the causes of irritation, the one great cause perhaps, is the fact that the individual master cannot, as a rule,

deal with the individual and isolated workman. But the reason is obvious; all the other workmen in the firm are more or less interested in the bargain made, or to be made, because it affects the rest; hence the union steps in, which after all is but the agent of the workmen, just as much as the manager is the agent of the master and no more. The men, in order to avoid reprisals, employ a delegate to adjust their differences, because they are not at all times able to conduct their own case; and they are often in danger of being taken singly, reduced one by one, and in the end subdued in the aggregate, were they to depend merely on their own individual power of resistance. Moreover one master represents in his own person a combination, or a force which is equivalent to it, for he can wait, the workmen cannot. After all, this objection to the alleged dictation of the union is little more than a farce, for it is not the union *per se* which calls into operation the elements of discontent; these are felt by the workmen in the particular firm, and they carry their grievance into the lodge-room of their society, where they plead for the necessary help to enable them to take such action as may be considered advisable.

§ 49. It is perhaps a bold thing to say, but the statement may be made with considerable confidence, that in ninety per cent. of the strikes which take place, the men directly concerned are the instigators and promoters, and that the union is the brake on the wheel which prevents too great precipitation, and liability to consequent failure. The union as such has plenty of work to do, without incurring the responsibility of promoting strikes, and it usually does all in its power to prevent them, unless good cause be shown for prompt action. Even in the ten per cent. left, the first step towards a strike is made from without, rather than within the union, that is, in so far as it relates to the leaders or committee; the pressure originates with the rank and file, the members working on a job, who feel no responsibility beyond giving their vote and challenging the action of others if the contest goes against them; some of these men are ever ready for a fight, they seldom count the cost, and are often careless as to the ultimate results.

§ 50. Of course there have been, and still are, hot-headed

leaders, fussy men who love a contest, because they then have a chance of coming to the front, men of little experience, and less prudence; these will be found in every cause. As a rule, however, the unions are governed by men of practical experience, whose character for prudence is established; the men themselves would not long tolerate an official who was a constant promoter of strikes. If proof were required in support of the foregoing statement, it can be found in the fact that in young societies, those of recent growth, strikes are more numerous than in older and better organised trades, and when they do occur, they are more reckless in the means adopted to attain their ends. "They strike before they are ready," as an old campaigner once said; in other words, they strike without reason, and often yield without defeat; they are hot to enter into a dispute, and have not the experience to guide the forces at their command so as to lead to victory, or win the respect of opponents if they lose. This is one of the evils to be dreaded, men ignorant of the past may provoke a dispute which older men would avoid; safety lies in a well organised, and properly conducted union. Mr. Frederic Harrison truly says: "As these disputes grow less lawless, they grow more disciplined; what they forego in direct violence they acquire in indirect destructiveness. They are gaining the system and energy of political struggles; they threaten the public peace, at least as much as the markets; they are becoming wars of classes for rights, institutions, and power." In the better organised trades, these disputes are often obstinate and prolonged, but they are less violent than in those where a combination is improvised for some special emergency, or where it is hastily formed to resist what the men conceive to be an act of injustice. In every case where a union has been long established, is strong in numbers, and in funds, strikes become less frequent than before. The reasons are obvious; the union, by its mere existence and active influence, keeps up the rates of wages, prevents reductions, and extensions of working hours. The Ironfounders, instituted in 1809, have seldom had any serious dispute since 1852, and when a dispute occurs we hear little about it; yet the union maintains a tolerably high rate of wages for its members, and they only work 54 hours per week,

or nine hours per day, on the average of the six days. In 1850 they worked from 59½ hours to 63 hours per week, with an average wage of about 23*s.* per week, the average now being about 30*s.* per week. The Engineers have only had about half-a-dozen strikes worth mentioning, since 1852, one of which was for the nine hours at Newcastle in 1871. The others have been mainly against piece-work, and overtime. Their hours of work in 1851 were from 57 to 63 per week; the wages ranging from 18*s.* to 34*s.* per week; they now get from 28*s.* to 40*s.* per week, for 54 hours' work, the latter being general throughout the country. The Carpenters had a prolonged contest in Manchester in 1876, but only two or three others of any consequence since 1860, while their wages have gone up from 33*s.* per week the highest to 42*s.* 6*d.* in 1889; while the hours of labour are reduced from 52 per week in 1864, to 48½ in 1889. With the majority of other unions, strikes have diminished in a direct ratio to their power of dealing with labour questions.

§ 51. Political economists, as such, had contributed little or nothing towards the solution of the labour problem up to the date of the first issue of this work. Where they touched the fringe of the question, they only produced further trouble by raising issues not germane to the matters in dispute, or discussed points in political or social economy or philosophy which, at the time, were inopportune and inappropriate, or they sought to apply some of the dogmas of their pet science in such a way as to make the working classes look upon it as a bugbear and a bogie, which was intended to frighten them from the pursuit of what they conceived to be their just rights. "If political economy be against us," said a Hyde Park orator, once, "we must be against political economy;" and the general impression at that time was that its teachings were opposed to the cause and rights of labour. That its doctrines generally were expounded as thus interpreted by the masses, there can be no doubt. And economical science will be so regarded until its exponents are able to agree amongst themselves as to what its fundamental principles are, and also as to the definitions, limits, and applications of these principles. It is not only in England that this disagreement exists. It is equally manifest in Germany,

and has been, ever since Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" was first translated into the German language. Of late years the divergences amongst professors and writers have become notorious. Two able articles in the *Fortnightly Review* may be cited in support of the above statement: (1) That by Gustav Cohen, in September, 1873; and (2) the one by Mr. Cliffe Leslie, in July, 1875.

§ 52. Since the preceding pages were first written, in 1877, much of the old antagonism to labour evinced by writers on political economy, and cognate subjects, has died out. Indeed, a new era may be said to have dawned. The old gospel of capitalists, and of the exponents of their views in the press, has given place to a broader and more humane political economy, in which *the man* is recognised as part and parcel of *the labour* which he has to dispose of, in order that he might exist. Many causes have contributed to this change. Organised labour and associative effort of all kinds have largely assisted to produce the change. The political enfranchisement of the masses has been a factor in the movement. The growth of liberal opinion, and the progress of legislation, have each been conducive to a healthier tone, as regards the relations subsisting between capital and labour. A generation of men worked for it, suffered for it, and laid the foundation for the quiet, almost imperceptible revolution which has taken place. A new class of writers has grown up, suffused with newer ideas, having broader sympathies, and with daring enough to question the conclusions of previously authoritative writers upon economical subjects. The literature of to-day is so far in advance of the opinions generally held twenty years ago, that it is widely tinged with what is termed socialism, in which school political economy, as applied to labour, is either not recognised at all, or is so applied that it means something quite opposite to the formulated conclusions of the old school. The transition is not complete, it has yet to be crystallised; but it needs no prophet to foretell that human labour will not in the future be divorced from the man-worker, and be treated as a mere commodity like pigs or potatoes, corn or cabbages, as was the tendency by most writers, less than a generation ago.

§ 53. In the earlier history of industry there existed political serfdom and social servitude, side by side, and usually in combination. In later times workmen have achieved a certain amount of political freedom; but there still exists with it a certain degree of social servitude, which is almost equally to be deplored with that of the past. What we now witness is a fierce struggle for industrial freedom, and a healthier social life. Political economy does not tell us how to achieve this, nor has it contributed very much towards its achievement. Hence it has failed in its assumed mission. In other departments of life, in dealing with the products of human labour, and their distribution; in matters pertaining to the State, apart from labour, it has a history which might be said to be not inglorious; but in its treatment of labour questions it has hitherto failed. The aspirations of the masses, and their efforts to carve out a path for themselves, in connection with human progress, have been stigmatised as rank socialism; even Christianity itself has been declared to be mere sentimentalism, when applied to labour and social questions. Be it so. Nevertheless, the conviction has grown, that it is our duty to regulate "servitude," if we cannot destroy it; and that society itself is interested in making it less burthensome to those who have to bear its yoke. In proportion as political economy can aid in this humane movement and tendency, so will it gain the ear of the working classes, and exert a beneficial influence upon their life and conduct.

CHAPTER V.

APPRENTICES AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

§ 1. The question of apprenticeships may be viewed from many stand-points; the employer, by taking an unlimited number of apprentices, seeks to obtain cheap labour, and thereby lower the standard wages of the journeyman; the workman, by attempting to limit the number, tries to lessen the power of the employer to reduce his wages by means of boy labour, and thereby facilitate an increase of his own earnings. Primarily there are three parties to be consulted in this matter—(1) the employer; (2) the apprentice; and (3) the workman—neither one of whom has the sole right of determining, under the existing circumstances of labour in the workshop, and the general conditions under which the apprentice is now taken and taught, the whole of the terms and stipulations upon which such apprentices shall be taken, without some regard to the manner in which the interests of the other parties are affected by the line of conduct that may be pursued, or by an attempt to adjust and settle the matters in dispute.

§ 2. There is also a fourth party to be considered, namely, what is termed the public; to some extent the public are represented in the person of the apprentice, but not wholly so, inasmuch as this phase of the question opens up the much wider ground of public polity, which is quite apart from, independent of, and often opposed to the immediate interests of those chiefly concerned in the controversy. Whenever there are conflicting claims, as undoubtedly there are in this instance, it is usual to examine into the title of each of the claimants, and having done so, to try and find a mode of settlement which

shall be equitable to all. Hitherto the claims of the workmen have been ignored and totally disregarded, as though they had no right to participate even in the discussion of this vexed question, much less to be considered as an element in its final solution.

§ 3. The history of apprenticeships is a curious and instructive one, but it is not essential for the purpose of arriving at sound conclusions, either as to the utility or effect of the system, or as to the wisdom or folly of the alleged restrictions which workmen endeavour to impose. There are, however, some incidents in the history of the past to which it is necessary to call attention in order to understand the altered conditions of labour, and the consequent changes which these have necessarily introduced affecting both employers and workmen, and relatively the apprentice. The system of apprenticeships is of early origin; it commenced with, and constituted a necessary part of, all skilled labour; it became the basis of the old guilds in their foundation and development; the customs formed by them were protected and fostered by legislative enactments, even after the guilds could no longer maintain their enforcement and observance, and many were the contests to ensure the continuance of those customs. By 5 Eliz. c. 4, the previous Acts were codified and consolidated, and their provisions extended to all the handicrafts of that time. Under that statute no one could lawfully exercise, either as master or journeyman, any art, mystery, or craft, or follow any employment or occupation, unless he had served a seven years' apprenticeship. This enactment gave legal force to all the old customs and usages which for centuries had grown up in the several handicrafts of the country.

§ 4. Even in places where the law, as such, was unknown, the same customs were followed in all places and in all trades by masters and journeymen. The law not only fixed the term which each apprentice had to serve, but also limited the number; the whole method of working, rates of wages, and other matters being regulated by the statute. As trade developed, and the use of machinery was introduced, there came a contest with regard to these limitations and restrictions, which lasted for a long time, and was fought with great bitterness on both sides.

When new industries arose, and these restrictions were attempted to be imposed, the courts ruled that the law did not apply, and that it only had reference to those in existence when the statute was passed; it was thus gradually narrowed and relaxed in its application.

§ 5. Amendments of the law, with the object of extending its provisions, were then sought by some of the old institutions and the journeymen combined, then by the journeymen alone, until in the year 1814, the old law was repealed by 54 Geo. III. c. 96, except in so far as it reserved the customs and bye-laws of the City of London, and of other cities, corporations, and companies lawfully instituted. But the abrogation of a law did not destroy the deeply rooted custom; although there were no longer any legal restrictions as to apprenticeships, the usage continued, and it was enforced more or less in all trades, except in the textile trades, and even in those it remained in force wherever the hand-loom was still in use.

§ 6. In the olden times the employer was also a workman; he had himself learned his craft and understood it so as to be able to teach it to another. The question, therefore, as to taking apprentices, rested with himself, and with the parent or guardian of those intended to be apprenticed. Usually they were what were called "indoor apprentices," that is, they were received into the family; they were fed and clothed, and slept in the houses of their masters, being in fact domestic apprentices, at a time when many of the industries of the country were chiefly domestic trades, instead of being carried on by large firms and establishments as they now are. These apprentices were bound by indenture to serve a master for a certain term, and in return for their services they were to receive instruction in the master's profession, art, or occupation. Generally the employer received a premium with the apprentice, as compensation for the time and trouble of teaching, and in payment for the cost of living, until the apprentice had acquired sufficient skill to make his labour remunerative.

§ 7. An apprentice when once bound was compelled to serve his master faithfully during the years of his servitude, and severe were the penalties inflicted upon those who were deemed

refractory apprentices. A master could, moreover, moderately chastise his apprentice for misbehaviour; and in years gone by, many a cruel tale could be told of the harshness to which some of these apprentices were subjected. A poor parish apprentice was, however, the greatest sufferer; his tales of woe have been told by Dickens, Frances Trollope, and others; but as the days of his sorrow have passed away, we may leave this phase of the question in the hands of the novelist, whose genius can best portray those features of a bygone time, by none of whom have the scenes depicted been too highly coloured.

§ 8. Suffice it to say that the only mode of escape from a cruel master or mistress, and from the drudgery of a scullery-maid's work, was by enlisting for a soldier, in which case, however, the indenture was not cancelled, for it was ruled that a bound apprentice could not legally enlist; if he did so, his employer could claim him and retain him, until the term of his apprenticeship had expired, when he was liable to fulfil his military servitude. Not unfrequently in these days the apprentices were spirited away by the pressgangs which used to infest our sea-port towns, to serve His Britannic Majesty on the high seas or in "foreign parts," in which instance the law of apprenticeship was set at defiance. But if a boy ran home to see a sick mother, after being refused leave of absence by an unsympathising master or mistress, he could be brought back and lodged in Bridewell, or some other "House of Correction," then to be returned to a vindictive master to be whipped, half starved, and bound to labour, not unfrequently from five o'clock in the morning until ten at night.

§ 9. Those were neither easy nor happy days for apprentices, and yet some persons look back on those "good old times," with a kind of sentimental regret, under the belief that the people were better fed, more kindly treated, and happier than they are now; this is altogether a mistake, for at no period of our history was there so much real and substantial interest taken in the welfare of the labouring population as at the present time, more especially in those who are under age, and who consequently cannot protect themselves. But in one respect the apprentice had even then the advantage: the master was

bound to teach him his trade or handicraft, and, as a rule, he was turned out a tolerably competent workman, which in that day meant something, for the multiplied divisions of labour now to be found in almost every industry had not as yet been adopted. A tailor could then make a complete suit of clothes, whereas now we have cutters-out, coat-hands, vest-hands, and trouser-makers only. No doubt there is some compensation in all this; but in the past a tailor made the man—that is, his suit of clothes—now it takes four tailors at least to fit him.

§ 10. The quarrel with regard to the limitation of apprentices had not at this period commenced—at least not in the sense in which it is now discussed. But a change was coming o'er the spirit of the dream; another day was dawning, fraught with still greater issues to the journeymen, for, instead of the old system of master and craftsman, there grew up quite another kind of mastership and of hiring. The master had already begun to be less the craftsman and more of the employer. Capital was fast becoming the great motive power. Streams were first utilised, then steam; complicated machinery was being substituted for hand labour, in many of the growing industries of the time; the master no longer worked at the trade himself—he directed and found the capital. Very frequently he did not understand the details of the industry in which he was engaged; an experienced hand was made overlooker, or oftentimes a middleman, whose duty it was to supervise every part of the work, and screw as much as possible out of the workers. The number of persons employed was also greatly augmented; instead of the old fealty between master and man there came estrangement more and more, until sometimes the workpeople scarcely ever saw their veritable employer. Under these circumstances the conditions of apprenticeship were completely changed, not suddenly, but gradually, until the apprentice became merely the boy-worker, with less wages, but more solemn engagements than the journeyman. The master to whom he was bound no longer taught him his trade; he was, so to speak, pitchforked into the workshop to pick up his trade as best he could, or to learn it from one or another of the many journeymen who were there employed.

§ 11. It was no one's duty to teach him; there was no pay for teaching and no responsibility. Is it, therefore, any wonder that the journeyman, who had no interest in teaching the boy, neglected to do so; or that he resented the introduction of too many boys into the workshop, thereby overstocking it by an unlimited number of those who must, as the workman thought, inevitably lead to a reduction of his wages? There was, moreover, a constant tendency to substitute boy labour for adult labour, wherever there was a possibility of doing so. This increased the workman's repugnance to the unlimited supply of an element which he regarded as peculiarly opposed to his own interests. The condition of the working people in Cottonshire increased this repugnance, for it was no uncommon thing to find men idle, whilst women and children were in full work.

§ 12. And it must be remembered that it formed no part of the journeyman's contract of hiring or of service to teach the master's apprentices; it was his duty to work, not to instruct, to perform his own labour, and not to give his own experience and the mysteries of his craft to a stranger for no recompense or reward, unless, indeed, it was the prospective reward of being shouldered out of the workshop by the very boy to whom he had imparted all his knowledge and skill. Was it, therefore, unnatural for him to raise obstacles and refuse compliance, or to try and fix a limit with regard to the number? What little knowledge he possessed of law and custom was in favour of this view, and his union, if he belonged to one, concurred in the opposition and encouraged it. Hence it was that the journeyman constantly battled for restriction, while the master more and more broke away from the old usages of the trade. In the earlier stages of these struggles the work of limitation was not so difficult, for many of the employers more or less coincided with the operatives. As the masters became great capitalists, with no bond of union between them and the workmen, the battle waxed fiercer, until we find that strikes, those terrible engines of industrial warfare, became frequent, with victory sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other; but with this general result, that in the end the ancient universal rule of apprenticeship was more and more relaxed, until it is now

very nearly abolished in all the more important trades of the country.

§ 13. The questions which naturally arise are: Has the trade of the country been benefited by this change? Is it better for the employer, for the workman, for the apprentice, and for the public at large? First of all it must be conceded, as a natural right, that every parent is justified in seeking for his child the best field for his labour, and that every boy should have the opportunity open to him of learning any trade for which he has a liking, or in which he has a good chance of earning a fair livelihood. It is not to be expected that the parent is able at all times to see whether the trade is overstocked, or if journeymen are already walking about seeking work and finding none; these conditions are seldom taken into consideration; and in so far as they affect "rights," they are of no weight whatever. In any case "rights" exist, and should not be restricted.

§ 14. This is the aspect with which the public mostly concern themselves; at least, it is so in the general discussion of the subject. They are chiefly affected by the question of freedom of labour and of contract, but they are also deeply interested in the matter from another point of view—namely, in the production of good craftsmen and skilled workmen in every department of trade; this essential feature of the apprenticeship system is too often overlooked. There is a general complaint that the skill of the British workman has deteriorated; whether rightly founded or not is not here the question, but few persons attempt to investigate the cause or causes of this alleged deterioration.

§ 15. The employers are chiefly concerned in being able to get cheap labour with the least possible trouble to themselves. Quantity is now the cry more than quality, and it is to be feared that there is a general disregard as to higher skill, so long as quantity pays the largest dividend. Slop-work and slop-workers are in the ascendant, and have been for some years. Houses are built to sell, by what are termed field-rangers or jerry-builders; boilers are scamped both in materials and work, and they tell their tale in the death-throes of those

who have to work them; mines are badly shored or bratticed, and ill-ventilated, and the terrible explosions, so awfully frequent, give us repeated warnings of the dangers thereby incurred; ships are built which, with all our scientific improvements, break asunder and founder oftener than of yore; our clothing, furniture—everything tells the same tale of scamped work; the public look on, shake their heads, and say it is the deterioration of our workmen.*

§ 16. The interest of the workman is mainly centred in the questions of wages, hours of labour, etc., and he regards the matter of apprenticeship, or rather the introduction of numberless boys, from this stand-point—how far will this boy labour tend to lessen his earnings, supplant him in his trade, and curtail his future chances of earning a subsistence? But there is another and very important question of consequence to the journeyman, and it is this, that whereas he has to teach the apprentice, there is no allowance for the instruction given, either in the shape of extra pay, or other privileges, except in a few trades, and hence the workman demurs to the practice of giving the experience of a life to another, for no personal advantage to himself, and with the probable result of future injury to his own prospects in life.

§ 17. The difficulty is, and ever has been, to reconcile these conflicting interests, so as not to unduly press upon either party; to, in fact, effect a compromise, conceived in a spirit of equity and fairness, which will not be disadvantageous to the workman, restrictive to the employer, or prohibitory to the apprentice, and generally suited to the altered conditions of industrial life.

§ 18. With regard to the effects of apprenticeships upon the skilled trades of the country, it is altogether doubtful whether the relaxation, and well-nigh abolition, of the system has been, or can be, beneficial. The constant cry that the English artisan and mechanic has deteriorated is very much due

* Since the above was written, in 1877, there has been a sensible improvement in some departments of industry, as regards skill and quality of work. It has been discovered that bad work does not pay in the long run. But work is still "scamped."

to the laxity of modern apprenticeships, for it is no secret that in the mass this deterioration is apparent, although there are and ever will be good sterling English craftsmen, in spite of the circumstances by which they are not unfrequently surrounded. But there are numbers of workmen who have only "picked up" their trade, so to speak, not learned it; and hence the proportion of good and efficient workmen, to the whole number in any one branch of trade, may be less than formerly. The abolition of the system of apprenticeships is therefore to be regretted, for the sake of the character of our workmen, and the quality of our work, and especially as there does not appear to be any efficient substitute for it.

§ 19. It must be ever remembered that the workman has but little or no voice in determining the character or efficiency of his work. One of the first conditions of good workmanship is the nature and quality of the materials with which the craftsman has to deal. If these are bad, the utmost the workman can do is to conceal the bad quality of the materials by the skilfulness of his manipulation. But even this is limited to mere outward appearance, which may impose on the purchaser, if only for a time; the bad qualities will, however, inevitably manifest themselves, and then the blame is everlastingly thrown on the workman. To effect even this semblance of good work requires more time than the journeyman can afford to bestow, or the employer is prepared to give; for not only is the workman supplied with bad materials, but he is badly paid; and therefore, in order to earn a living, he has to follow the example set him by the employer with regard to the materials, and scamp his work, until by the combination of both we get slop-work and slop-workers. Bad materials require more time and skill than good in order even to make a fair show of quality; and yet the necessary time and skill cannot be given in consequence of the price paid for the work. The Egyptians wanted the Israelites to make bricks without straw, and at the same time make as many as theretofore; the poor Jews struck because of this injustice; but we have never heard them condemned for their resistance, and yet the conditions were precisely the same as those in some of our modern industries.

§ 20. There is of late a partial revival of good workmanship in many trades, and skill commands a higher premium than it has done for a long time, but it will require years of toil to recover our lost ground in the markets of the world. The goods sent abroad by Sheffield and Birmingham were notoriously at a discount in consequence of the flimsy stuff of which they were made; Lancashire and Yorkshire suffered in a similar manner by the exportation of shoddy produce and manufactures, until our colonies, Continental Europe, and even Asia, were driven to repair the injury done to them by manufacturing their own goods. Then forsooth there came the cry that it was the bad English workmanship which has caused all this, when in reality it was the miserable cheating of unprincipled and unscrupulous manufacturers and traders, under the pressure of a competition as ruinous as it is indefensible.

§ 21. The old saw, "live and let live," seems to be no longer the rule, but the exception; in lieu thereof we have as a substitute "starve and be starved," so long as we can put money in our purse; and if, in this strange race, the goods are sold at prices which will not pay, why the remedy ever ready at hand is, to grind down the wages of the operatives to the lowest possible point, or swindle creditors by a composition in the pound. There are plenty of noble exceptions to this cruel policy; the goods of some manufacturers are world-renowned for their quality, like Morley's hosiery goods; but the notoriety of even a few ship-loads of bad wares will produce more evil in one year, than can be remedied during many years, by a really honest export trade.

§ 22. The minute division of labour in many trades is another cause to be considered in determining the value of English craftsmen, and with it also the extensive use of machinery in the manufacture of most articles of commerce. These two circumstances, either singly or combined, have the effect of impairing the efficiency of the workman in the more general sense of being able to undertake a complete branch of any one trade. At the same time it must be confessed that greater skill is attained in the special parts assigned to each worker, and, what is of supreme importance in the matter of cost, the work is done more rapidly, and therefore more

cheaply; and moreover greater perfection is attained in the completed work, even when it has been performed by a variety of hands. Hence we find that although a workman may not be able to go through all the branches of his trade, yet the work of the nation as a whole, has not suffered, or in any way degenerated, for our manufactured articles, taken at their best, will bear comparison with those of any nation in the world. In order to understand the apprenticeship question, in its practical bearings on English trade, it is necessary to ascertain the practice in the several industries of the country, in order to see whether the accusations hurled against the workmen are well founded, and how far the alleged restrictions are actually in force; and, if so, whether they produce the injurious effects attributed to them. With this object the rules of the unions of the chief trades of the country have been examined, the practices actually enforced being referred to in detail. To do this briefly but fully several trades are grouped, so as to present a bird's-eye view of the working of the apprenticeship system, and its active influence, in all the leading industries of the nation. This classification will avoid constant repetition of details, and at the same time give a tolerably correct statement of the whole, in its practice and results.

§ 23. It is said that trade unions, by means of their restrictive rules and limitations, are responsible for the decline of the old apprenticeship system, and also for the alleged difficulties with regard to foreign competition, inasmuch as they throw obstacles in the way of cheap production, and thereby close against us the markets of the world. These two accusations will best be met by a detailed account of the practices of the unions, in order to see whether facts bear out the conclusions generally held on these questions. With regard to the actual practice, the rules in force in the following trades, embracing most of the leading industries of Great Britain, show both the action and influences in operation in the majority of trades, and may well be taken as representing those of the entire country.

§ 24. *The Engineering and Iron Trades.*—In few trades, perhaps, is there greater necessity for serving an apprenticeship, than in those comprised in the various industries here termed

the "Engineering trades." These embrace engineers, fitters, pattern-makers, millwrights, and smiths, to which other branches have been added, associated together in the society known as the Amalgamated Engineers; the Steam-engine Makers; the Ironfounders or moulders; the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders; Iron and Steel workers; and some smaller bodies of workmen connected with the Birmingham and Sheffield branches of industry. Technical instruction is more important in these industries than in almost any other; but however advantageous it may be, it can only be supplementary to, and ought always to be coupled with, the practical instruction given in the workshop.

§ 25. The rules of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, as revised in May, 1885, provide that "the society shall consist of smiths, fitters, turners, pattern-makers, millwrights, planers, borers, slotters, mechanical draughtsmen, brass-finishers, and coppersmiths, employed in the engineering trades; machine-joiners, employed in the construction of cotton, silk, flax, woollen, or other machinery; and shipsmiths." The branches of this industry are thus extended so as to include new classes of work and of workers, developed since the formation of the union in 1850. The qualifications for admission to membership in the society are that the candidate "shall have served five years at the trade before the age of twenty-one." "Smiths not having served their time in an engine or machine shop shall be eligible for admission" if they "have worked five years successively at the trade, and are good workmen," in the receipt of the ordinary wages in engine or machine shops, or in shipbuilding for at least twelve weeks previously to admission. "Any person not having served five years before the age of twenty-one," may be admitted after he "shall have worked successively at the trade for five years; but planers, borers, and slotters must have so worked for seven years at the trade before admission. Machine-joiners must be employed in the construction of cotton, silk, woollen or other machinery, and receive the usual rate of wages paid to other departments mentioned in Rule I. Mechanical draughtsmen must have legally served an apprenticeship in one of the other branches of the trade mentioned in Rule I., which rule defines who may be admitted

as members, as above enumerated. The foregoing are the regulations as to apprentices in the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. In actual practice these rules and regulations do not operate so as to limit or restrict the number of apprentices, or enforce conditions as to working at the trade. A person who has worked at any branch of the trade successively for five years, is a competent workman, and is in receipt of the current wages in the district, finds very little difficulty in becoming a member of the union, on being nominated by two full members, who have worked with him, and can vouch for his eligibility for membership, as a working engineer at the special branch at which he is employed. The real object of the restrictions, such as they are, is to ensure capacity and skill, and to protect members of the society from an influx of incompetent men, incapable of earning the full rate of wages, and who if admitted into the union would become a burden to the society, by being constantly on its funds in consequence of their inability to secure permanent employment, at the rate of wages current in the district. The binding of what are called "regular apprentices," is becoming more and more infrequent in the engineering trades. In some shops the proportion of boys to men is out of all keeping with the requirements of a skilled trade, but there seems no help for it until the public see that the present loose system, or rather want of system, is disadvantageous alike to the skill of the journeyman, and to the trade of the country. Premiums are seldom paid with these so-called apprentices, although in some firms they are still required, in which case they are either paid to the firm or to the foreman, but no remuneration or recompense is given to the journeymen, who practically instruct the lads thus nominally apprenticed.

§ 26. The Steam-engine Makers' Society is distinct and separate from the Amalgamated Engineers, although generally it comprises the same classes of workmen in the engineering branches of trade. Formerly the society was mainly confined to the counties of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Cheshire, but it has now branches in various other counties. In the matter of apprentices the tendency in this society has been to tighten the rules, rather than to relax them. The "persons eligible for

admission as members are fitters, erectors, turners, pattern-makers, millwrights, smiths, and draughtsmen engaged in the engineering trades, or makers of tools used in the manufacture of steam-engines." Others "may be admitted who have served a legal apprenticeship, or worked continuously at heavy ordnance works, gas-engines, hydraulics, electrical engineering appliances, or other branches of engineering work." Persons are not eligible who have served their time in textile factories, or in sewing-machine works, unless they have worked continuously for a further period of three years in an engine, or engine tool shop. "A candidate for admission must have served a legal apprenticeship of not less than five years to any of the before-mentioned trades, expiring on his twenty-first birthday, or have worked continuously for five years in an engineering establishment," except in certain cases provided for. The exceptions are where candidates have served in other mechanical trades for four years, and have thereafter served or worked for three years in a *bonâ fide* engineering establishment.

§ 27. The Ironfounders, or Ironmoulders as they are sometimes called, theoretically "stand by" the system of apprenticeship; but in reality they do not enforce either limit or restriction, beyond what is regarded as an inevitable result of the nature of the occupation, and the practical difficulties of employing boys in a calling requiring the strength, as well as skill, of adult workmen. Not a shilling is ever paid to the journeyman for his trouble in teaching boys, and the late secretary of the society could not recollect any such mode of payment during his forty years' experience. Notwithstanding this, it is often the boast of a journeyman that he has turned out such and such a lad as an efficient and clever workman, for the union men look upon it as most disastrous to the trade to "turn out" men who are bunglers, and who, as a consequence, must ever be a drug in the labour market. It is seldom that the full number of boys, theoretically allowed by the society's rules, are taken by any shop or firm, for the simple reason that boy labour, beyond a certain limit, is neither productive nor useful; when attempted it is only done in inferior shops, where the poorest kinds of wares are produced.

§ 28. The rules of the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders provide "that no person shall be admitted a member of this society who is not a legal boiler-maker or iron-shipbuilder," that is, "angle-iron smith, plater, riveter, caulker, or holder-up." "The person proposed shall have worked not less than five years continuously at the trade, previous to arriving at the age of twenty-one years, as an apprentice." Persons proposed as members above thirty years of age, must have worked at the trade five years previously to attaining twenty-one years of age, and pay a higher entrance fee than those admitted before thirty years of age. Apprentices who have worked at the trade for two years, before attaining the age of eighteen years, may be admitted as members, but they are not admitted full members until twenty-one years of age, and then only by the members of the branch upon being satisfied that they are competent workmen, and are morally fit to be retained as members. The number of lads employed is not to exceed one to every five journeymen averaging over the entire year. This is one of the few trades in which the members of a union have been able to tighten the rules and regulations respecting apprentices. These are more stringently enforced than they were some years ago, the possibility of doing so having been the result of some rather severe struggles in the earlier history of the society, especially in the north and north-east coasts of England, and on the Clyde. In the report for May, 1890, there is a complaint of too many apprentices in proportion to men.

§ 29. The Iron and Steel workers have no restrictions or limitations affecting boy labour; the work is very laborious, but less skilful than in the preceding trades, all kinds of unskilled labour being utilised according to the exigencies of the employer, and the demand for the material by those requiring it, whether for manufacturing purposes, or for exportation. In no sense can it be said that the Iron and Steel workers impose any kind of restriction or limitation with regard to the employment of boy labour, other than the laborious nature of the work demands.

§ 30. In some of the smaller branches of trades carried on in Birmingham and Sheffield, attempts have sometimes been made to enforce conditions with regard to the employment of boy

labour, but most of them are as free and unrestricted as the most ardent opponents of restriction could desire. To such an extent is this the case, that a demand has arisen in some of these trades for the intervention of law, so as to prevent young boys and young girls being employed at too early an age, in occupations less fitted for their capacity and tender years than the textile manufactures, now so completely protected by statute. Especially is this the case in the manufacture of chains, nuts, and bolts, nails, screws, and other hardware goods, in Staffordshire and Worcestershire, where even girls of tender age are employed to an extent and under conditions which are almost incredible. The deplorable state of the workers in those trades is frequently the subject of comment, in consequence of the severe animadversions by factory inspectors in the district, and by others who have investigated the matter.

§ 31. *The Building Trades* comprise probably about 750,000 adult males, distributed throughout every town and village in the United Kingdom, and consequently form, perhaps the most important, certainly the most general, of all our national industries; and hence their rules and mode of action affect more or less the whole of the trades in the country. In some branches of the building trades, efforts have from time to time been made for the purpose of limiting the number of apprentices, and otherwise imposing restrictive conditions with regard to them; but they have been practically useless. The rules of most of the societies are now so far relaxed as to be inoperative, and, in many of them, their enforcement is altogether impossible. The following statement represents the actual policy and practice of the several unions among the building operatives of this country:

§ 32. (1) The masons, by reason of their extensive and compact organisation, were formerly, by their rules, more restrictive than any other body; but even with them there is now no rule limiting the number of apprentices. Actual apprenticeship is no longer needed in order to obtain admission into the society. Competency as a workman, and the ability to earn the current wages of the district, as a journeyman, are the only conditions required, no matter how these are obtained. In some cases, efforts were made in past years to impose restrictions, but the

attempts arose out of local circumstances and customs, each branch being responsible for its own action in dealing with questions which only concerned the trade usages of the district. The society as a whole, does not attempt to enforce any limitation as to the number, or to define the period which apprentices shall serve. The Scottish Society does not attempt in any way to interfere with either the number of apprentices, or the term of service. The trade is essentially open to all comers, without let or hindrance.

§ 33. (2) The bricklayers have practically neither limitation nor restriction. In a few districts, especially in connection with the "Manchester Order," mostly in the northern and midland counties, regulations are inserted in their schedules stating that the number of apprentices shall be limited relatively to the number of journeymen employed. These varied according to the customs and usages of the district or place where the schedule or rules applied. Strikes sometimes took place for the purpose of enforcing these restrictions; they are now infrequent, and seldom successful, for the customs are so various, and the necessity of modifications so frequent, that any hard and fast line was found to be impossible, and the attempt to do so is abandoned. In the London district, in the southern and eastern counties, and virtually elsewhere, the trade is practically open without restriction.

§ 34. (3) The carpenters and joiners have several unions, such as the Amalgamated Society, the General Union, the Scottish Association, and others, the rules and regulations in force being pretty much the same in all. Although in this branch of industry considerable technical skill is required, and a large sum of money has to be invested in the purchase of tools alone, yet in effect there is neither limitation as to number, nor restriction as to the time to be served, in the rules of either union. These societies practically discountenance all regulations having for their object the limitation of apprentices; they have no rule bearing on the question, and no strike would be sanctioned which attempted to enforce such a regulation. There may in some towns be a kind of mutual understanding between the journeymen and the employers, that the number of apprentices shall be in proportion to the number of adults

employed, but these are matters of agreement, due to local usage and established custom, and not to restrictive rules. If a youth can "pick up" his trade, and can prove his competency to earn the current wages of the district, there is no obstacle to his admission into the society as one of its accredited members. The extensive use of valuable and complicated machinery in this trade, has tended to discourage boy labour, as lads cannot be trusted to work the expensive machinery employed in the several branches of joiner's work.

§ 35. (4) The Plasterers' Society does not attempt to limit the number of apprentices, or enforce any specified period of time during which they shall serve, as a condition of membership. Ability to earn the average wage of the district is the only qualification required for admission into the union. In the matter of learning the trade, the sons of the workmen have naturally the first chance, but it is constantly being filled to overflowing by the "hawkboys," or servers, who in time become journeymen plasterers, but a large proportion of these seldom acquire sufficient skill to be able to undertake the finer class of work, such as mouldings and modelling, which can only be done by first-class skilled workmen.

§ 36. (5) The plumbers have been, and are still, to some extent, at least, more successful in their efforts to impose restrictions and limitations; in this branch of the building trades the master plumbers, as a rule, rather encourage than disapprove the action of the workmen, with the object, no doubt, of keeping the "trade select." In some places they are able to enforce restrictive rules, especially in localities where the business of "plumbing" is carried on as a distinct trade, separate from that of the general builder. Even in this trade, the restrictions and limitations actually enforced are inconsiderable, and do not exist to a sufficient extent to be able to greatly influence the number of workers, or generally to affect the trade in any appreciable degree.*

* Within the last few years the plumbers have instituted a system of registration, under the auspices of the Plumbers' Company in London. The movement has been largely supported by municipal and local authorities, and will doubtless conduce to a higher degree of skill in the trade.

§ 37. (6) With regard to painters, decorators, and glaziers, there is absolutely no restriction, and no limit, either as to numbers or time, and indeed it is questionable if any boys are now "bound apprentice" to these branches of the building trade. Yet considerable dexterity and skill are required in the higher branches of painting and decorating, which can only be obtained by long practice and careful study; but there is also a great deal of slop-work done in the cheaply built houses, run up by speculators, without regard to stability, or the beauty of their internal or external decoration.

The only towns in England where there is any kind of attempt at limitation or restriction in the building trades as to apprentices, are in the northern and midland counties; in those the masons and bricklayers endeavour to enforce some rule as to the number of apprentices, and strikes have sometimes taken place in consequence. Whenever disputes occur, and they are but seldom, union workmen try to fix the proportion at about three apprentices to seven journeymen.

§ 38. *The Printing and Bookbinding Trades.*—(1) The London Society of Compositors (Rule 5) define the condition of membership as follows:

> That every compositor working as a journeyman, overseer, storekeeper, reader, or in any other capacity in a fair house, or who may hereafter prove his right so to work, either by indenture or other satisfactory evidence, or by a clear card of membership from a recognised Society, shall be eligible as a member.

Rule 10 (Turnovers) is as follows:

> That all persons known by the name of "Turnovers" shall be re-bound to an employer by means of a legal or written witnessed agreement within a period of one month from entering an office; and unless this agreement be produced at the completion of their servitude, they shall not be admitted to the Society without the sanction of the Committee.

In this society the members generally insist upon a seven years' apprenticeship as a condition of membership, but a provincial apprentice, having served five years, is accepted as a member, provided such five years had expired when he arrived at twenty-one years of age. This is the theory; but in practice

the custom in the trade has been, and is, so variable, that a few years since the society collected information from the several "chapels," as the offices are termed—through the recognised head or chairman of the office, technically called the "father of the chapel"—as to the prevailing custom.

In the London printing offices a seven years' apprenticeship is accepted and acted on, together with a limitation of one apprentice to three journeymen. At one time there was very little restriction or limitation in actual practice with regard to boys who are technically called "turnovers," who were employed *ad libitum* in many of the smaller offices, where they picked up a certain amount of skill, and afterwards gained admission into the society as journeymen. In reality, the only thing demanded of them was proof of having served at the trade for seven successive years, and even that term of service was not absolutely required to be continuous for one master, as the youth might have served in seven offices during the seven years; the certificates of seven years' service being all that was required, proof of such service was deemed sufficient. So powerless were the London Society of Compositors at one time with regard to the enforcement of the full term of apprenticeship, and other conditions connected therewith, that about fifteen years ago all fines were temporarily remitted for those who had not acted in accordance with the rules of the trade. As a rule, compositors get no remuneration for teaching boys, or "turnovers," hence a good deal of dissatisfaction has manifested itself.*

* The following return shows the improvement that has taken place in the London printing trade as the result of better organisation among the compositors:

Year.	Houses.	Journeymen.	Apprentices.	Turnovers.	Proportion. A. J.
1837	94	1,110	425	...	1 — 2½
1840	95	1,343	534	...	1 — 2½
1847	124	1,901	495	140	1 — 3
1867	99	2,344	547	103	1 — 3½
1877	180	3,601	961	112	1 — 3⅘
1880	169	3,901	874	94	1 — 4
1889	306	6,679	1,412	83	1 — 4½

§ 39. (2) The Typographical Association, which embraces most of the large towns in England, exclusive of London and Leeds, has had frequently to consider this question of apprentices; the rule is, that persons shall be eligible for admission as members who have served a seven years' apprenticeship at case or machine.

Rule 41 states that:

(1) The maximum number of apprentices in each recognised office shall be three; and until an office has been in operation at least twelve months, the number of apprentices shall be confined to one only.

(2) All boys intended as apprentices must be bound or practically withdrawn within three months from their introduction.

In effect, the rule is one apprentice to any office, two, to four journeymen, and three, to six or any larger number.

With this society, as with the London one, the question has to be periodically reopened at delegate meetings in consequence of the difficulty of conforming the practice of the trade to the theory of their rules. In many places the employers do not take as many apprentices as the rules of the society, if strictly enforced, permit; in other cases there is a superabundance of boy labour, and, indeed, very little else. Great difference of opinion exists, even within the society, with regard to the attempted limitation of apprentices, although the rules are always confirmed by a large majority. In some towns the rules are strictly adhered to, in others they are practically disregarded; hence a certain latitude is allowed to the executive to deal with the varied circumstances which arise from time to time, so as not to resort to the extreme measure of closing an office. Some towns have had to decline joining the Association, and become purely local societies, because of their inability to carry out the rules. Since the formation of this association in 1849, numerous strikes have taken place, many men have been sacrificed, and large sums have been expended, for the purpose of trying to maintain these restrictions, but they have usually failed. However stringent the rules may be, in actual practice they have not the effect of limiting the number in the trade to any appreciable extent.

§ 40. (3) The Printing Machine Managers' Society, being more limited in numbers than the compositors, is able to insist upon a seven years' apprenticeship, by "stamped indenture," and to limit the number to about one apprentice to three journeymen, or in the ratio of three to seven. In this branch of the printing trade, the journeymen are allowed half the boy's earnings for the first year, or they are "paid a fee down," of something like two guineas, for the instruction to be given to the apprentice, so as to enable him to acquire the requisite knowledge of his trade. Not long since, the workmen of a London firm struck work because two persons employed could not show their indentures of a seven years' apprenticeship, but they were unable to carry their point, as the employers found other men to fill their places. The office is now closed to society men until, by a kind of legal fiction, they see fit to reopen it without the concession asked for. These legal fictions are often resorted to in order to avoid the necessity of permanently closing an office; the question is, would it not be better to avoid the disputes which lead to this disagreeable alternative?

§ 41. (4) The Lithographic Printers are also able, by reason of the smallness of their numbers, to maintain similar restrictions and limitations. As the trade is in fewer hands, the masters appear willing to aid the journeymen in effecting a limitation, so as to prevent its extension unduly to their disadvantage. Here also the journeymen get a fee, or a certain proportion of the boy's earnings, for giving him the required instruction in his trade. In all branches of the printing trade, it is usual for the regular apprentices to be bound by indenture or stamped agreement, which costs half-a-crown.

§ 42. (5) The Bookbinders for a long time were able to limit the number, fix the term, and otherwise restrict apprentices, but since the introduction of women into the trade, the rules have been considerably relaxed. At present they are not able to enforce regulations with regard to apprenticeships, although they are still retained in the rules. Here also the practice does not go on all-fours with the theory; in order to avoid the logical but disagreeable consequences the unions do

not look too closely into the matter; they have, in fact, to wink at the violation of their own rules.

§ 43. *Domestic Trades.*—(1) The Shoemakers were able at one time to enforce apprenticeship as a condition of entering the union; but this has long ceased to be the case. Taking the whole of the United Kingdom, the number of legally bound apprentices would at present be extremely few, and where they are taken there is seldom any indenture, or even written contract; there is certainly neither limitation nor restriction. Within the last quarter of a century the boot and shoemaking industry has undergone almost a revolution, both in the character of the work, and the mode of working. Machinery and labour-saving appliances have entirely changed the conditions, and transformed what was once a domestic industry into factory life.

§ 44. (2) The Tailors make no attempt at restriction or limitation. Apprentices are not altogether unknown, but they are comparatively few, and these few are to be found only in the best shops. Of late years the journeymen have been chiefly recruited from the ranks of those who have had their first lessons in "slop establishments," some of whom have subsequently become improvers in better-class houses. A great deal of the tailoring work is still done "at home," the "shop system" being as yet only adopted by the better class of masters and firms. Female labour is largely employed by wholesale manufacturers, and also by journeymen at home. Some of the evils arising out of this kind of domestic manufacture—described as the "sweating system"—have recently been brought before parliament, with the view of a stricter enforcement of the Factory and Workshop Act, or of the Public Health Act.

§ 45. (3) The Hat-making trade is divided into three branches, called "shapers," "body-makers," and "finishers"; they are not so numerous as either of the two preceding trades, but their organisation is compact, and their rules are stringent. In 1877 an amalgamation took place between the London Society and the General Society in the provinces, when a revised code of working rules was agreed on. The system of apprenticeship by indenture is enforced in the hatting trades. The time each

apprentice shall serve is fixed at seven years; the indenture must be witnessed by one or more journeymen, or it is not considered legal. Any person employing two journeymen, and having been in business eight months, is entitled to one apprentice, and for ten journeymen two apprentices; and one additional apprentice for every ten journeymen who may be employed. An employer having sons may take one as an apprentice, in addition to the number specified, but such son must be under indenture. Journeymen may not teach their own sons the trade, unless bound by indenture; and any man so acting is liable to be expelled from the society. Any member teaching a man, not a member of the society, any branch of the trade, is liable to a fine of £5. Indoor apprentices are not now known, and premiums are seldom paid, not indeed in one per cent. of those who are taken into the trade. The rules and restrictions with regard to the limitation of apprentices are more stringent in this union than in almost any other; but even here it does not appear to have had the effect of producing any scarcity of hands.

§ 46. *Shipping Trades.*—Perhaps no class of workmen have striven more pertinaciously to maintain the old system of apprenticeships than the shipwrights; but the restrictions have been considerably relaxed of late years, especially since the introduction of iron-shipbuilding, which developed quite a different kind of trade. When this first began, the aid of a class of workmen called boiler-makers and riveters was called in; these soon acquired the necessary skill, and are now known by the name of boiler-makers and iron-shipbuilders. For some time the shipwrights made a show of resistance; but, as they were unable to do the work themselves, they had to give way, so that now we have the iron-shipbuilders as part and parcel of the Boiler-makers' Society. The shipwrights used to be a most exclusive body of men; for many years they enjoyed special privileges; in many sea-port towns they formed a numerous body of freemen, and exercised great power in parliamentary elections. A vestige of this old exclusive feeling remains, but circumstances have changed, and therefore they cannot retain their former power. When iron plates were first substituted for "the wooden walls of old England," the shipwrights tried to

resist the introduction of the new invention, but they signally failed; they then tried to insist upon the employment of shipwrights in building the new ships, but in this they were also unsuccessful. Although the old seven years' apprenticeship system cannot now be enforced, they still sometimes make a show of resistance to the introduction of apprentices. Considerable effort has often been made to maintain the custom, but the union is unable to exercise any material control over the employers, so that practically speaking there is very little restriction or limitation, either as to the number, or as to the term of years for which apprentices shall be bound. Workmen who have served four years in Her Majesty's Dockyards are received into the union. These are usually under contract, the higher grades of shipwrights in these yards having to serve a seven years' apprenticeship under "indenture."

§ 47. *Glass-making Trades.*—In some branches of these trades attempts to limit the number, and otherwise impose restrictions with regard to apprentices, are much more successful than in other trades. The responsibility for these stringent rules rests almost equally upon the shoulders of the employers and journeymen, for some of the mysteries of the craft are kept back from the learners until the last year of their apprenticeship. There seems to be an endeavour on the part of both employers and employed to keep the trade as restricted as possible; but doubtless there are certain reasons why the number of boy learners cannot be unlimited, altogether apart from trade union rules and regulations. The number and conditions can only be arranged and decided upon by those who stand in the relationship of masters and journeymen, having due regard to the nature of the employment, and the work which can be allotted to boys or learners. When apprentices are taken, it is usual to allow the journeymen a certain sum, or extra wages, for the instructions to be given; this varies from two guineas paid down, to 10*s.* 6*d.* per week for the first year. By this practice an amount of responsibility is thrown upon the workmen, who are thus bound to pay proper attention to the apprentice during his term of apprenticeship, and to teach him the mysteries of the craft; and also upon the master, whose duty it is to see that

the apprentice is efficiently taught, especially as he usually receives a premium with each apprentice.

§ 48. *Coachmakers.*—The Coachmakers' Society have to some extent been able to enforce restrictions with regard to apprentices, but in their rules these are put in the form of a request to the employers not to employ more than one boy to three journeymen, rather than in the nature of a demand, or of an invariable rule. It is asserted by the journeymen that in few cases only do the master coachbuilders ever attempt to go beyond that which the men declare to be a fair proportion, inasmuch as a larger number of boys could not well be employed on account of the skill, care, and nicety required of the workers, in all branches of the trade. Disputes have sometimes occurred with regard to attempted limitations on the part of the unions, but they have not been numerous or important, and they have not materially affected the general condition of those engaged in coachbuilding. In some towns the custom or usages of the place or district are more stringent than in others; and strikes to enforce regulations have taken place, but these are exceptional rather than general, and are mainly the outcome of local custom only.

§ 49. Cigar and tobacco manufacturers form a very numerous class in England, a large number of women and girls being employed as workers. In some few places the cigar-makers have a tolerably good union, but their action is usually limited to questions of wages, hours of labour, etc., and does not affect the number of boy learners or girls employed in the trade. Virtually there is no limitation or restriction.

§ 50. *Jewellery and Watch-making.*—In the higher skilled branches of these trades apprenticeships are still common, but not in the limited and restricted sense that they were formerly. The great subdivision of labour in these, as in many other branches of industry, and the use of machinery, have enabled manufacturers to introduce young boys, and thereby to relax considerably the old rules as to apprentices. A good deal of this kind of work is done at "home" by small masters, or by journeymen, both of whom take as many learners as they find to be convenient and remunerative. Although premiums are by

no means unusual, great numbers are taken as apprentices without such payments, and virtually the practice of limitation is abandoned.

§ 51. Cabinet-makers, and others employed in the manufacture of household furniture, occasionally make efforts to impose regulations in shops and firms as to apprentices, but as a rule they are not carried out; in the present condition of the trade they are absolutely without effect. Isolated attempts to do so fail in their object, and they are seldom made by the authority of any responsible trade union.

§ 52. *Ceramic Wares.*—The manufacture of these wares has been considerably extended in England during the last half-century, especially in regard to the finer and more artistic productions in china, porcelain, and ornamental pottery; in some of these branches Worcestershire, Staffordshire, and Lambeth can compete with almost any country in the world. In all these important trades a large number of girls and boys are employed, little or no restriction or limitation being enforced, or even attempted.

§ 53. *The Factory Workers.*—These embrace numerous classes employed in textile manufactures, such as silk, linen, cotton, woollen, alpaca, jute, and other fabrics, whether for personal wear, adornment, domestic ornamentation, or other uses. The earlier battles for the maintenance of the apprenticeship system were fought by those engaged in these industries, but the system was resisted and abolished, until hardly an apprentice is to be found in the whole of the vast industries included in the term factory workers. The only restrictions imposed in these trades, with regard to the employment of boys or girls, are those fixed by law, otherwise there is no limitation. The system of apprenticeships survived longest in the silk trades, where the hand-loom continued in use; but even in this branch it is doubtful if an apprentice, legally bound, could be found in "Spitalfields," Macclesfield, or Coventry, unless, indeed, some may still be apprenticed in the latter places for the purpose of obtaining the freedom of the town, or as a means whereby local charities may be utilised and expended.

§ 54. *Miscellaneous Trades.*—Among what are called the

unskilled trades, such as the miners, agricultural labourers, railway servants, and miscellaneous occupations of all kinds, there are no apprentices, and consequently limitations and restrictions are unknown. Boys are sent into the mines, or fields, or other industries, to work at the earliest age permitted by law. As regards railway servants, requirements for the safety of the workers and of the public practically prohibit the employment of youths under a certain age; the chief thing required of them is a fairly good character for honesty, sobriety, and civility. Bakers, butchers, sugar-refiners, and similar occupations are in much the same condition, the first-named only having any kind of society, and this one is comparatively weak, poor, and inefficient. Apprenticeships were at one time pretty general with the bakers. Sugar-refiners in this country are usually Germans; these have no regular union, and no restrictions.

§ 55. This review of the rules and regulations in the chief industries of the country, with especial reference to the action of trade unions affecting apprenticeships, and particularly as regards their attempts to limit the number, and define the term for which apprentices shall be bound, points to certain conclusions which the collection of facts seems to establish, and to indicate others which are deducible therefrom. As a result of such investigations, the following condensed statement of the whole case, as it stands, is presented:

(1) The old law with regard to apprenticeships having been repealed, no statutory or legal formularies or restrictions are binding upon masters or journeymen, in the matter of apprentices, either as to the number which may be employed, or the term for which they shall serve. It is simply a question of free contract, or agreement between the master on the one hand, and the apprentice, his parents, or representatives, and the journeymen on the other; but when a contract or agreement is once entered into, it is enforceable by law. The only legal exceptions remaining are in the case of surgeons, apothecaries, proctors, solicitors, attorneys, and notaries, in which professions the term fixed by law is five years. There is also a bare remnant of the old law in cases of parish apprentices; but the system has nearly disappeared.

§ 56. (2) The old form of "indenture," which is the technical term for the instrument of apprenticeship, is no longer necessary or even customary, excepting in a few of the more restrictive trades, or where it is required by the regulations of corporate towns, as a condition of obtaining the freedom of the city, or to ensure special advantages. Even where an apprentice is bound for a term of five or seven years, the "indenture" is not general. The custom as to written or verbal contracts varies with the locality, or usages of the trade, both methods being equally binding and enforceable at law; where the law is silent upon any disputed point, the usage or custom of the trade, or district, is accepted as evidence of the contract.

§ 57. (3) The term of apprenticeship is at present extremely variable; it ranges from twelve months in the case of an "improver"—that is, one who has managed to "pick up" a certain amount of knowledge of the trade, and then seeks for improvement in a better shop—to the full term of seven years, for those "properly apprenticed." The more usual terms for apprentices, who are "bound," are three, four, or five years, according to the nature of the occupation, the custom recognised by the trade, or local usages. Some trade union rules nominally —that is, on paper—exact the full term of seven years, others of five years, but in practice the full term is rarely enforced.

§ 58. (4) The payment of premiums on taking apprentices was at one time well-nigh universal, at present it is exceptional. In the generality of trades, embracing all those of the manual labour class, such as artisans, mechanics, etc., premiums are seldom asked, or required. There are certain exceptions to this rule, but they are the result of causes quite separate from the question of learning the trade, such as the restrictive regulations of old corporate towns, in cases where the freedom of the city is an important consideration, because it goes with the apprenticeship, if the apprentice is bound to a "freeman." This privilege is still extant in many of the guilds of the City of London, although in most instances the freedom can be bought by persons in no way connected with the trade of the special company, or it may be given to individuals, for various reasons, or for public services, who have nothing whatever to do with

the trade of, or the most distant connection with the City. Similar restrictions and powers exist in other cities or corporate towns, such as Bristol, Coventry, Stafford, and many others in England; it is, in fact, a remnant of the old guild system, and of the customs which sprang therefrom.

§ 59. (5) It is generally supposed that the decline of the apprenticeship system has been due to the rules and regulations of trade unions, whereas whatever remains of the system is chiefly owing to their action. Their whole history is one long record of persistent, and sometimes not over wise, efforts to maintain and enforce the apprenticeship system, as the only means, in their opinion, for securing good and capable workmen, in every branch of labour. Many struggles and contests with employers have arisen in connection with this question; the object and aim of the craftsmen being the continuance of a system which ensured to them superiority of workmanship, and in effect protected them from an influx of boy labour and unskilled workmen. It is altogether beside the mark to object that this was, after all, a mere selfish policy for the furtherance of their own ends. By whatever motives the workmen may have been actuated, the result of their action was the maintenance of the skill of British handicraftsmen.

§ 60. (6) The real cause of the decline of the apprenticeship system was the opposition of employers—especially those of the capitalist class, which has been persistent and continuous for more than a century—to any restriction whatever in regard to those whom they chose to employ, which restriction, when attempted, they resented as an act of interference with the freedom of labour. On the face of it this seems plausible enough, but when it is considered that the skilled craftsmen have to instruct the unskilled, generally without fee or reward, it will be seen that they are contributing to their own displacement, disestablishing themselves in fact, without the slightest possible chance of compensation, present or future. Under such circumstances the resistance of the operatives appears but reasonable, or at least excusable. It is worthy of notice that whilst employers generally oppose the continuance of the apprenticeship system, it is gaining favour in government

establishments, it has been widely advocated in the mercantile marine, and efforts have been made in recent years to encourage a return to some reasonable and practicable mode of apprenticeships.

§ 61. (7) Without doubt the altered conditions of trade have also contributed very much to the decline of the old system; with the development of machinery came division of labour; the craftsman was no longer required to produce the entire article; one part was done by one person, another part was given to some other; and hence, in many trades, a boy, or an unskilled labourer, could acquire sufficient skill to perform his portion of the work in much less time than formerly. The full term of seven years' apprenticeship, under these circumstances, is therefore not necessary, and consequently it may be imprudent on the part of trade unions, in such cases, to insist upon the old term, under the new and greatly altered conditions. The obvious conclusion is that the period of apprenticeship must be governed by the requirements of each special trade, as no general rule can be applied indiscriminately to all trades alike.

§ 62. (8) Employers are not by law restricted as to the number of apprentices which they may take, but in some trades the journeymen endeavour to limit the number. Wherever a limit is so fixed it is the result of an understanding between the workmen and the employer, or is due to an old-fashioned custom still recognised in the trade. The stringency with which it is enforced differs materially, not only with regard to local usages in a particular trade, but also in the same trade according to the custom in the locality. Where these limitations are in force, the proportion usually observed is about three apprentices to seven journeymen, a ratio by no means prohibitory, and which certainly does not close the trade against new-comers, or the rising generation.

§ 63. (9) One of the most important things, if not the most important of all, in connection with apprenticeships, is that the master himself no longer teaches the apprentice; the duty of instructing him falls upon the journeyman, and hence he feels aggrieved unless he is in some way recompensed for his trouble, and paid for his experience. This is seldom done; the few

instances in which it is customary to give the workman a pecuniary interest in the apprentice, such as the glass trades, some branches of the printing trades, and a few others, are set forth in the preceding pages. In these instances the master gives to the journeyman either a stipulated sum, or extra pay for a certain time, for teaching the apprentice. Where this is not done the skilled workman not only takes no interest in the apprentice, but he feels that he is giving to another the knowledge and skill which he has acquired by long service and experience, often at considerable expense, without the slightest recompense, and which ultimately will be used to his own disadvantage, by filling the trade to overflowing, and end in a reduction of his own wages. It is scarcely in human nature not to consider such a contingency, and to provide against it by every possible means.

§ 64. (10) Trade unions seek to protect their members against these evils; their remedies may not always be wise; they are often better adapted to old usages now passed away than to present circumstances; but they cannot be expected to consider the effect of their policy on capitalists, or the public, unless some consideration is shown to the interests of the workmen. One thing, however, may be conceded, namely, that it is not wise to retain merely nominal rules and regulations, which are not, and cannot be, enforced. In theory, many of them say you shall not be a member of the union unless you have served an apprenticeship of seven years to the trade; in practice this condition of membership is so relaxed that it is rarely enforced.

§ 65. (11) The primary object of apprenticeship is the acquirement of practical skill and efficiency, in the particular craft or trade which the apprentice desires to learn, and every rule or regulation in furtherance of this object has a certain value, if properly applied. The intention of the apprenticeship rules in the constitution of a trade union, is to ensure efficient workmen, this being the one absolute condition of being admitted as members of the organisation. In so far as the unions strive to maintain the superiority of their craft they will command the sympathy of the general public; if it should appear that the rules are intended to be prohibitory, to exclude

others from entering the trade, they will be denounced as inimical to the public good, destructive of trade, injurious to masters, mischievous to the general body of working people, and a barrier to progress, instead of contributing to the welfare of the country.

§ 66. (12) Indoor apprentices are not now numerous; the change from small masters to great capitalists, or to large and wealthy firms and companies, has had the effect of almost entirely abolishing the old custom of domestic apprentices. The apprentice is merely a learner, a kind of youthful journeyman, rather than an apprentice in the sense in which it was understood in the past. In the olden times he was received into the family; in some cases he was subjected to harsh and cruel treatment by heartless and dissipated masters, but by others he was treated kindly and considerately. But amid all this the master was bound to teach the lad his trade, and usually this was done, even if accompanied with hard knocks, bad living, and general unkindness.

§ 67. (13) What remains of the apprenticeship system is chiefly confined to "outdoor apprentices," the boy sleeping at home, providing his own food, and simply going to work in the morning and leaving at night, like ordinary journeymen, the only difference being that he gets less wages, which amount is augmented year by year until the end of the term; and in law he is regarded as being more directly responsible to the master for his general conduct. Whilst the law is strict in compelling obedience on the part of the apprentice, or in the punishment of a refractory one, it is also just towards him, in so far as treatment by the master is concerned. Formerly the prisons were full of refractory or runaway apprentices, at present they are by no means numerous; both by law and custom they are now properly protected, and their condition is better than at any former period. Neither indoor nor outdoor apprentices are required to perform any kind of domestic drudgery, and it would scarcely be sanctioned by the justices if it interfered with the boy's learning his trade.

§ 68. (14) Contracts of apprenticeship, when once entered into, whether orally or by indenture, cannot be rescinded or

cancelled except by the consent of all the parties thereto. Consequently no notice from either side can have the effect of putting an end to the contract, except by mutual assent and agreement. If a desire should arise, on the part of one of the contracting parties, to annul the obligation, and the other side should refuse, it can only be cancelled by a magistrate or justice of the peace, by whom alone, in case of a dispute, can the contract be annulled, and, where deemed necessary, compensation be awarded to the other side. If an apprentice runs away, or absents himself from work without his master's permission, he may be ordered to return to his work; and, on his refusing to do so, he may, under the Employers and Workmen Act, 1875, be ordered to be imprisoned for any period not exceeding fourteen days. This extreme measure is not often resorted to, although many cases occur during each year. Masters, as a rule, consider that apprentices who require this kind of correction are not worth the trouble and cost of prosecution; and also that any loss consequent upon misconduct is less to him than it is to the apprentice.

§ 69. (15) After an apprentice has served his term, whether it be long or short, no obstacles are placed in his way of getting employment, or becoming an employer. Experience in his craft, and the ability to earn the current wages of the district, are the only essential conditions as to employment. With regard to becoming an employer, in addition to his knowledge of the trade, the possession of sufficient capital is required, with which to commence his enterprise. In some towns there are charitable endowments for the purpose of aiding young men of good character to start in business, by providing them with a loan which has to be repaid within a specified time. One such at least is still in existence in London; others are to be found in various parts of the country; but, like many similar endowments, they are not always put to the best of uses, or utilised for the benefit of those for whom they were specially intended.

§ 70. (16) There is, generally, very little difficulty in becoming a member of a trade union, if the candidate be an efficient workman and can earn the current wages. In some unions questions are asked as to the completion of his term of

service, and in a few he is required to produce his indenture, but usually it is not necessary, no evidence being demanded, either as to the term served, or as to the fulfilment of the obligations devolving on such as may have been apprenticed. The few more restricted trades which try to enforce regulations and obligations are not sufficiently numerous to affect the whole trade; their failure to do so is notorious. Scarcely ten per cent. of those admitted as members of trade unions have been "properly apprenticed" by indenture for the full term of five or seven years.

§ 71. (17) Certificates of character are neither given nor required in any of the ordinary occupations or industries in England, with the exception perhaps of the engineers, as before explained. The only passport necessary to obtain employment is skill and ability to do the work, and to earn the stipulated or customary wages of the district. "Written characters" are only needed in the case of domestic servants, railway servants, and those seeking positions of trust; they are not usual in any of the ordinary trades or occupations of the country.

§ 72. (18) The hours of labour for apprentices are, theoretically, fixed solely by the employer; exceptionally they may be defined in the instrument of contract, or by mutual agreement; this, however, is not general, nor is it necessary, for, as a rule, the hours of labour for apprentices are regulated by the customs of the trade, that is, by the working hours of the journeyman; the law, however, recognises the right of the apprentice to Sundays, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, subject to certain conditions of a special kind and character.

§ 73. The general conclusions which may be drawn from the foregoing may be briefly summed up as follows: (1) That the manifold rules and regulations of trade unions do not materially interfere with the free admission of apprentices into the several trades of the country. (2) That no dearth of workmen is caused in any of these trades by their restrictive action. (3) That apprenticeship is absolutely necessary for the purpose of acquiring a practical knowledge of a trade; without this there can be no real guarantee for good and efficient workmanship.

II.—TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

§ 74. This chapter would not be complete without some direct and special reference to the question of technical education, inasmuch as it has a direct bearing upon the subject matter of apprenticeships. For many years this question has engrossed the attention of educationists and scientific men, and more recently of all classes and sections of the community. And it is but fair to state that few men have taken a deeper interest in this matter, or urged its necessity with greater importunity, than the more intelligent trade union officers and leaders.

§ 75. Its vast importance is now almost universally recognised, and efforts are being made to provide technical instruction for workmen engaged in nearly every native industry. The great national institution at South Kensington has for forty years taken the lead in the good and useful work. Under its auspices classes have been formed in nearly all the chief centres of industry, for the purpose of teaching the principles of science, in their relation to the arts and manufactures, developing the tastes of those who are employed in the several branches of trade, and training the eye and the hand, both in design and execution.

§ 76. The Society of Arts some years since elaborated a scheme of Technological Examinations in connection with the classes of South Kensington, on the basis that each candidate must be a workman engaged in the special branch in which he desired to be examined. The subjects of the examination included the theory, scientific principles, and practical details connected with certain trades, and particularly the application of science to art workmanship. It is scarcely necessary to add that the success of these Technological Examinations, for various reasons, was not great. Other and similar attempts, on a smaller scale, and of a fragmentary character, have also been made, having the same objects in view, with more or less success. These attempts were somewhat in advance of the times, but the effort deserves recognition.

§ 77. More recently the City Companies, or London Guilds,

were roused to action. Some of them proposed and set on foot a scheme, having for its object the erection and endowment of a Technical University, or College, where scientific instruction should be given in the arts and manufacturing industries of the country, with especial reference to the development of the taste and skill of the artisan classes. A body was founded in 1878 for the purpose of creating a central institute in London for technical education, for giving assistance to trade schools, in London and the provinces, for promoting technological examinations, and for making grants in aid of existing institutions. Special reports upon the subject were invited from several gentlemen, that by Professor Huxley being the most important. The Institute was incorporated in 1879, in which year negotiations were commenced for the purpose of securing a site. It was but just and natural that the Guilds of London, with their vast wealth and historic associations, should take the lead in this great movement. The duty of initiative, on a large scale, was incumbent upon them, by reason of their origin and connections. The scheme was scarcely in embryo when the preceding pages were first written. It is now an accomplished fact. But the original intention seems to have been modified, or changed. The building was intended to have been erected on the Thames Embankment, within easy distance of all parts of the metropolis. The City and Guilds of London Institute is situate at South Kensington, the centre of so many other educational institutions, far from the "madding crowd," surrounded by wealth and fashion. Experts are there trained, or to be trained, to teach the artisan classes, whenever suitable provision is made for instruction to be given to workmen engaged in various trades. Provision is made at the Technical College, Finsbury, for instruction in applied mathematics, mechanical and electrical engineering, applied physics and chemistry, and applied art. Many excellent classes are there carried on with success. At Bradford, Leeds, Birmingham, Manchester, Nottingham, Huddersfield, Sheffield, and other places, similar work is being carried on. In London, at the People's Palace, and at the Polytechnic Institution, in Regent Street, the same kind of useful work is in progress. It is but

fair to the City Companies to state that many of them have voted large sums towards these objects, in addition to contributions in connection with their own special work at South Kensington, the Finsbury Technical College, and elsewhere. The Shipwrights' Company have taken an especial interest in the craft of shipbuilding, and have held exhibitions, consisting of models, showing the skill, invention, and art attained in this trade. The Plumbers' Company has been, and is, assisting the craft in their efforts to ensure greater skill and proficiency in this most important industry. The Clothworkers' Company, the Drapers' Company, the Fishmongers' Company, the Mercers' Company, the Goldsmiths' Company, the Cordwainers' Company, the Ironmongers' Company, and many other companies, have contributed to these and similar objects with a munificence not unworthy of their historic name and renown, whenever they throw themselves, with public spirit, into a great movement for useful objects.

§ 78. Within the last three or four years there has been a fuller and wider development of the desire to extend technical education. The funds of the London parochial charities having been placed by parliament in the hands of the Charity Commissioners, a very considerable sum is proposed to be devoted to technical education, and Polytechnic Institutes, or other Institutions having similar objects, are being, or are about to be, founded in the metropolis, east, west, north, and south, and also in the central parts of London, with the view of providing technical instruction for the people. The fact of those large funds being so available seems to have evoked a spirit of generous emulation. Large contributions have been given, and promised, by wealthy public-spirited men, supplemented again, in many instances, by the City Companies, for the purpose of building and endowing those institutions. The probable result will be that, in a few years, London will be able to vie with any city in the world, in the matter of Educational Institutions, Technical Colleges, and possibly Free Libraries.

§ 79. The cause of technical education advanced a further stage last session. After much hesitation and delay the Government proposed and succeeded in carrying a measure

empowering local authorities to supply, or aid the supply of technical or manual instruction, out of the local rates. A measure for Scotland was carried in 1888. The English Act is not so complete or perfect as it might have been; but it is a step, and a long step, in advance. Slowly, and by degrees, preparations are being made by some municipal and local bodies to utilise the provisions of the Act, by providing accommodation, appliances, and teachers. Local bodies are proverbially slow in their movements, and it will need the energy and enthusiasm of the ratepayers to arouse them to action, in many places. Some such men will be found within the Municipal Councils, Local Boards, and Vestries, whose sympathy with the objects of the Act, and whose unselfish public spirit will prompt them to take such action as may be deemed needful for the locality, and advantageous to the people. In any case, parliament has conferred the power. Local activity must do the rest. The responsibility is with the local administrative authority. But a portion of the annual cost will fall upon the Imperial Exchequer, the amount so borne being in proportion to the efficiency of the instruction given, and the progress made by the students. The question of increased local taxation ought not therefore to alarm the ratepayers or their representatives.

§ 80. The one great lesson to be learnt is, that technical education can, at its best, only be supplementary to a knowledge of the practical details of the trade, which must be acquired in the workshop. With the spread of general education, through Elementary schools, the children of the working classes are better fitted to receive technical instruction than they were in the past; their faculties have become receptive and perceptive to a degree hitherto unknown, or known only in isolated cases. By tuition and discipline their native shrewdness and energies will be developed and guided in such a way as to fit them for entering the workshop, where the whole of their previous training may be utilised and made serviceable to an extent not now contemplated.

§ 81. One of the effects of this general education and training will be, that the necessity for a long term of apprenticeship will be lessened; the sharp and active boy who enters the work-

shop at fourteen will have acquired at eighteen what in former times could scarcely have been obtained at the age of twenty-one, and hence a *three*, *four*, or *five* years' apprenticeship, according to the nature of the trade, will serve the purpose equally well as the full term of seven years in the past. It is when he commences to learn the handicraft that the real work of technical education must begin. The youth can only be taught the scientific principles which specially pertain to his craft, and their application in the workshop, after he has begun to learn his trade; and this instruction should be continued side by side with the experience gained in his daily labour. Apprenticeship, in some form or other, will still be needed, nay, is imperative in properly learning a trade, as nothing can possibly supersede it. Technical education will assist in developing and guiding the latent skill and acquired expertness of the boy, and thereby produce a class of handicraftsmen who, in the higher branches of art workmanship, will be second to no similar class of workmen in any part of the world.

§ 82. The initial steps have been taken, the foundations have been laid, plans have been suggested, schemes formulated, and the materials are ready to hand. Much, however, even of preliminary work remains to be done. The working people have to be stimulated and prepared to receive this instruction, and to seek for it, as not only a valuable but indispensable auxiliary to the training of the workshop. The difficulties surrounding the subject are still great, but they are not insurmountable. Active opposition has been abandoned, but apathy is almost a greater obstacle to be overcome. The seed has been sown; it is fructifying in the ground; but it will only mature by careful watching and aiding, according to its kind. In due time, if we faint not, do not neglect duty and opportunity, the nation will reap a plentiful harvest. It is essential for the full development and permanent success of technical education, that it should have Government aid, and be under Executive control. By no other means shall we be able to reach the furthermost nooks and corners of these islands, and bring the blessings of so beneficent an enterprise home to every door. Local initiative and supervision are necessary. Local effort will infuse life and

activity into the movement. The nerve centre must, however, be the Education Department; the pulsations will then be regular, the nerve power healthy, and the circulation complete through all the ramifications of the body politic, to the minutest extremities.

§ 83. One other weighty consideration might be urged for prompt and vigorous action in this matter of technical training. Great efforts have been and are being made by our competitors on the continent of Europe, and in America, to train the artisan classes of their respective countries, extending over a long series of years. Three-and-twenty years ago we were informed by Messrs. Creed and Williams, and subsequently by reports issued by the Education Department, as to the efforts which were being made, and the progress which had resulted therefrom, in Belgium, in France, in parts of Germany, and in other countries. Since that date further investigations have been made, and other reports have been published, all confirming the conclusion that England was lagging behind in technical education. The relative condition of British workmen in this respect has not improved in an equal ratio with that of foreign workmen; whilst the superiority of foreign employers in technical skill to that of British employers is more apparent still. What is being done abroad for the industrial classes, should at least be imitated at home. With such extended technical and scientific training our workmen need not fear the competition of the world.

CHAPTER VI.

I. PIECE-WORK. II. HOURS OF LABOUR. III. SYSTEMATIC OVERTIME.

I.—PIECE-WORK.

§ 1. THERE is, on the mind of the public, a general impression that trade unions, individually and in the aggregate, are diametrically opposed to piece-work, and that there is a firm determination to "put it down," and stamp it out, in all the trades of the country. One simple and very obvious fact will show that this conclusion is a false one; it has arisen from popular prejudice, caused by misrepresentation on the one hand, and from inadequate information on the other. There are many trades in which piece-work is the general rule, and the workmen in those trades would as strenuously resist the introduction of day-work, as in other trades they endeavour to restrict piece-work within the narrowest limits. In the tailoring trades, in shoemaking, and in most of the other industries engaged in the manufacture of articles for personal wear, payment by the piece is nearly universal, for the simple reason that one man can do his part independently of another; he is thus responsible to himself for the amount of work to be done, and the wages to be earned, and to the master for the quality of the work performed. In the printing trades much of the work is done by the "piece," for the same or similar reasons. The same method of work is adopted in many other trades, where the payments can be calculated in a fair and equitable manner, and the practice can be easily and methodically carried out. In a speech delivered by Mr. Mundella, M.P., at a meeting of the National Association

for the Promotion of Social Science, on March 20, 1876, he is reported to have said that no less than 90 per cent. of the manufactures of this country was paid for by the piece; a portion exceeding, he stated, that of any other country in the world. Possibly 90 per cent. might be an exaggerated estimate, although quite unintentional on the speaker's part; there is, however, this much of truth in the statement, namely, that the quantity of work done by the piece is far greater than most people have been led to suppose, or can even imagine. This fact was so forcibly impressed on the mind of Mr. Mundella, that he repudiated strongly the assumption that workmen in all trades were equally opposed to the system of piece-work, and that they resisted it whenever they could do so, no matter how desirable it might be, or how advantageous to the employer in the first instance, and indirectly to the consumer.

§ 2. Supposing only 75 per cent. of the ordinary manufactures of the country were paid for by the piece, that is a large proportion of the whole; and many reasons can be given why in certain trades piece-work is not feasible, and cannot well be adopted, in consequence of the "complications and difficulties," as Lord Brassey terms them, that lie in the way. In many discussions which have taken place on this subject, it is generally assumed that the only obstacle to the universal adoption of piece-work is the obstinacy of the workmen, and that this opposition is unreasonable and indefensible. The only thing that can be said in favour of such speakers and writers is that they are totally unacquainted with the actual conditions of labour in the workshop, and the requirements of the trades upon which they sit in judgment; and even when they do make inquiries, they usually confine themselves to one side only. In a paper on this subject by Mr. Frederick Hill, the writer quotes the opinions of several masters, but not one answer from the workmen; Mr. Hill should know that these *ex parte* statements would not be accepted in a court of law. No sound conclusion can be arrived at except by hearing both sides; and in this matter, of the relative value of piece-work as against day-work, each and every case must be decided on its own merits, all the surrounding circumstances and conditions being properly and

carefully considered and examined by judges competent to decide.

§ 3. In discussing this question it is necessary to define accurately what is meant by piece-work, in order to avoid the confusion which exists in the minds of many persons, by whom it is confounded with sub-contracting, or the gang or butty system, both of which differ materially from what is commonly understood as piece-work, and must be argued on vastly different grounds. (1) Sub-contracting is the sub-letting of portions of the original contract to smaller masters, who take certain parts of the work and engage the workmen requisite for its completion. This is sometimes necessary in the case of very large undertakings, such as the construction of railways, canals, water-works, extensive drainage, etc., where careful supervision by a single individual is well-nigh impossible, by reason of the many difficulties in his way, arising from distance, diversity of work, and the multifarious details which would be bewildering to one man's brain. But sub-contracts are not, as a rule, favoured either by architects or engineers, for they know full well that in too many cases where the original contractor is a man of high character, and holds himself responsible for the due execution of every clause in his contract; the sub-contractor, on the contrary, is frequently a mere task-master, who is utterly regardless of the quality of the work. He is almost entirely irresponsible, his only care is to get as much work done as possible in a given time, in order "to draw on account" as much as he can from week to week, or month to month, as the case may be. So recklessly scamping has been the work of sub-contractors that in many contracts a clause is inserted forbidding any portions of the work being sub-let. Architects and engineers know by experience that the supervision of work is always more expensive under sub-contracts, than it is where they are not permitted, and that "clerks of works," with high salaries, have to be engaged to watch every portion of it as it proceeds, in order to see that it is well and properly done. Many a railway tunnel has fallen in, many bridges have given way, and many a house has split asunder, mainly as the result of this system of sub-contracts, which, if the work had been done by

the original contractor, would have stood "firm as a rock." The practice is generally repugnant to those who are primarily responsible, namely the architects and engineers; it is dangerous to the public, and in the end it entails heavy loss upon those who have to find the money, and who, consequently, pay the penalty for the faulty work. Sub-contracting is condemned by all who know anything about it, as a losing game, except to those who profit by the losses which such a system inflicts on the public, who, in the end, are called upon to pay. But these are not the only evils of sub-contracting. There used to be a set of unprincipled men who made a living by taking task-work, especially in the building trades, and after driving the workmen to death for a week or a fortnight, drew all the money they could, and decamped with it, without paying the workmen a farthing for the wages due, and leaving them minus their Sunday's dinner. Thirty years ago, this was no uncommon thing in London, until one of the Metropolitan magistrates decided in a case which came before him, that if the sub-contractor did not pay the workmen, the original contractor was liable; this decision had the effect of checking so nefarious a system, and of preventing so palpable an abuse.

§ 4. Another evil arising out of the practice was the custom of paying the workmen at public-houses, the sub-contractor getting a bonus from the publican on the amount spent. Often and often the men were kept until ten or eleven o'clock on the Saturday night, hanging about the public-house for their wages, which the not over-scrupulous sub-contractor had drawn from the builder, contractor, or owner, early in the day. Cases sometimes occurred in which the men had to fight for their wages, and the scamp who withheld it has even been turned upside down, and the money shaken from his pockets on the floor of the public-house, each man scrambling to obtain sufficient to pay himself. In other parts of the country there were serious riots on pay nights, the causes of which have never been properly explained to the public. Another plan was adopted by these men for plundering the work-people, namely, the truck or "tommy" shop system, as it used to be called, where bad provisions were sold at high prices, the difference going into the

pockets of these middle men. The reasons for the intense hatred of the workmen to sub-contracting are not generally known; many of the journeymen themselves at the present time only know of the evils by hearsay; but the cause for such hatred is well founded, and is known beyond a doubt to those who have had any experience in the history of labour. That a system fraught with so many evil consequences to respectable contractors, to architects and engineers, to the workmen, and to the general public, should be almost universally condemned, is not surprising; the surprise rather is that any one, who has given the subject any serious thought, should be found to defend it. In any case sub-contracting is doomed to die, because of its own inherent evils and the heavy losses entailed on those who have had to pay so dearly for bad and slovenly work.

§ 5. (2) The gang, or butty system, is altogether a different thing from sub-contracting as above described; it means that a number of men agree together to take certain parts of the work, and divide the earnings *pro rata* among them; in some cases, no doubt, it may be used with advantage, in others it is absolutely impracticable. Lord Brassey in his book on "Work and Wages" gives instances where gangs of navvies undertook work on the butty system, to their own advantage and with profit to the employer. But in case one of the men fell ill, his wages for lost time would have to be calculated at so much per day, and hence if one man's earnings could be so calculated, that of all the others could be similarly adjusted. A good and capable foreman knows, or should know, how much work ought to be done by each man individually, and by all collectively and in concert; and he can so arrange his men that the net result shall be the same, whether by the day or by the piece. Moreover the butty or gang system has evils of its own, as every one knows who has seen it in operation. The "drinking bouts" of railway gangs used to be notorious, and bad luck to the poor fellow who refused to join the drunken revellers. The fact that the gang system has nearly died out is of itself a sufficient condemnation of the practice, for if it had been mutually advantageous it would have survived; as it is, neither masters nor men sigh for its revival. There may be instances in which

a few picked men may beneficially act together, by co-operating in the production of some article, or in the performance of some special work; but the cases are exceptional, and cannot be made general. If they could, the men would cease to be mere journeymen, they would, by the very necessities of the case, become co-partners, and possibly employers.

§ 6. Piece-work, properly so-called, can only be adopted where each individual workman can perform his task unaided by, and independent of, the active co-operation of others. One man can make a pair of shoes, another can make a coat, without the concurrent labour of another man; so also where the division of labour is great, each part being done singly, the parts may be done by piece-work without interference, or participation of others in the one special part, although the article can only be completed by the aggregate labour of the whole. In numerous cases, however, there are "complications and difficulties" which render piece-work more or less open to serious objection theoretically, and not by any means easy to put in practice. One of the great difficulties in the way of piece-work is the interdependence of one workman on another, and the almost impossibility of one man producing the article by his own unaided skill and efforts. For instance, if a bricklayer undertook to do the brickwork of a house by the rod or perch, he would have to depend on the labourer for his bricks and mortar; if he hired labour, he would at once become a sub-contractor. Again he would have to depend on the carpenter for the woodwork, frames, joists, and centres for arches, etc.; on the scaffolder for the scaffolding, the brick merchant for bricks, the carter for sand and lime, which would materially interfere with the performance of his own labour. He can, and very often does, cut the arches and even set them, by the piece; and undertake the brick-pointing by the foot or yard; but it is not so easy to undertake the entire work. It is still more difficult, nay impossible, for several bricklayers to undertake piece-work on the same job; sub-contracts, or the gang system, is the only alternative in such a case. The same thing holds good with regard to masons and plasterers, although not quite to the same extent. With carpenters and joiners there is a little more scope;

one man can make a door, another a sash, another a cupboard, etc., and often these are done on the piece-work system. But the question may here be asked, if piece-work is so desirable, why it is that employers fight so shy of it; why is it that so many of them never attempt to enforce it? The reason is that there are practical difficulties in the way of its adoption, known only to those engaged in actual labour, either as employers or workmen. The fact is, there are a number of trades to which it is quite unsuitable, and the fuss made about piece-work comes from dilettante dabblers in social statics, or political economists, more than it does from practical men engaged in manufacture, who are less interested in the solution of the labour problem than in the matters of profit and loss, which to them is all important.

§ 7. In a number of trade unions there are rules which aim at circumscribing piece-work, and, if possible, preventing it altogether; the members of these unions best know how far the system is suitable to their trade, and also what its tendency is wherever it is in operation. Some of the reasons urged against it are as follows: (1) Piece-work in many cases has the same effect as task-work—it is, in fact, but another name for it—it superinduces a kind of high pressure speed which only the strongest can keep up, and those only for a limited time. No man in his senses would attempt to drive his horses at a wild stretch-gallop over a long journey, especially if it had to be performed day after day. He would know that if he were guilty of folly so mad, of conduct so culpable, he would have to pay dearly for it in the end. If the horse had a fancy for wild freaks of this nature, his master would curb his impatience and moderate his pace, well knowing that not the journey, but the pace, would be his ruin. Why is it that some naturally kind-hearted employers are less careful of their workmen than of their horses or cattle? Are they of less value?

§ 8. As a rule the man who is employed at piece-work, excepting in trades where, from the nature of the work, it is habitual and general, is more spasmodic and less regular in his work than the day-worker; he frequently runs himself aground, and then he uses stimulants to assist him in keeping up the

speed. He can often take an hour or a day, and by dint of driving will contrive to make it up, at least in part, during the rest of the week. This kind of work is not a fair test of a man's abilities; what is wanted is a fair average day's work, taking one day with another, all through the year. Piece-work as a rule will not give this. If an engine-driver lingered on some part of his journey, and then forced his engine at high pressure over the other part, he would be regarded as a dangerous and reckless fellow to whose care the lives of passengers should not be entrusted. Regularity is required, as well as speed, in all trades and occupations, for the moral of the fable of the tortoise and the hare is as applicable in the case of labour as it is in every other department of life.

§ 9. Again, when the price of a certain job is fixed on the piece-work principle, the employer usually takes the quickest workman for his sample and test, and calculates the price accordingly; by this means he tries to fix a maximum wage for the worker, the less expert workman falling below that price, in proportion to his lack of physical power to compete with the strongest. This seems fair enough on the face of it, but it is not so fair as it seems, for the strong man will tax his strength to earn as much as he can, while the weaker will overtax his in order to compete, and to enable him to earn anything like decent average wages. It is the old tale, after all, of the masters trying to fix a maximum wage, and the workmen trying to fix a minimum; if employers are justified in seeking the one, the workmen are equally justified in trying to enforce the other. Moreover, by means of piece-work, employers are often able to cause wages to fluctuate—with a tendency ever downwards; if a man earns a few shillings over the current wages of the district, the conclusion usually drawn is that the price paid is too high, and must be reduced; hence an effort is perpetually being made to lower wages. Again, each man so working is more isolated, and as a consequence weaker, and therefore the more likely to be compelled to accept a reduction, because he is detached from his fellows. This is the secret of some employers' love for piece-work, and of their desire to enforce it, wherever practicable; and this is precisely the reason

why the workmen strive, as far as possible, to restrict it within the narrowest limits. The mode of fixing the price is one great obstacle to its universal adoption, another is its inapplicability to many of the industries of the country.

§ 10. The great evil in connection with piece-work is the tendency to "scamp" the work; the chief interest a man has in his work is to get it done, and receive the wages, beyond that his interest is *nil*. This is the reason why the best work is usually done by the day, skill being more requisite than speed —the man has time to finish his job in all those small details which make true workmanship, and distinguish a real work of art, from the ordinary productions of the workshop. It is useless to talk about a man's pride in his work, he will take as much pride in it as he can afford, neither more nor less; if art workmanship be required, it must be paid for, time being often the equivalent of skill: if the former be denied, the latter cannot be effectively exercised.

§ 11. These arguments mainly affect those trades in which the combined labour and skill of many, are essential to the production of the completed article of manufacture, whether that article be a house, or a steam-engine. They are not intended to apply to articles which can be produced by the labour of the individual workman, or to those in which the separate and distinct parts may be done by one person, notwithstanding that the whole may ultimately require the work of several in order to fit it together, so as to complete the article, and render it a perfect commodity, ready for sale.

§ 12. In all such cases the parties to the contract are the best judges, and it will be found that wherever piece-work is compatible with the nature of the trade, it will be accepted without interference from the union, or resistance from the individual workman; but where, on the contrary, it is obviously incompatible with the character of the work, day-work will be found to be more prevalent, because better suited to the requirements of the trade, and the condition of those engaged in it. That there are well-grounded reasons in favour of piece-work, where it can be satisfactorily introduced, will not be denied, but many of the alleged evils in connection with

day-work could be removed with a little care on the part of the employer, and of the foremen or overlookers whom he selects to look after his interest. The idleness and loss of time in a workshop is as often due to the want of efficient organisation, and proper foresight, as it is to the listlessness or sloth of the labourer. It has been wisely said that "sloth, like rust, consumes more than labour wears;" and no man's time hangs so heavily on his hands as the man's whose work is slothfully done, or whose part in the work is so badly arranged that he has to eke out a job, so as to make it last until another is ready for him.

§ 13. If piece-work is such an unmixed good, how is it that it has not been universally adopted in Government establishments, even in those in which the mechanical trades are chiefly employed? If any one, say an M.P., were to propose that the clerks in the several departments of State should be paid by the piece, what an outcry there would be; every member of the Civil Service would subscribe his mite towards ousting so impudent an innovator. In commercial establishments it is precisely the same; men cannot at all times be paid by the piece; there must be mutual confidence between the employer and those employed by him, and the greater that confidence the less liable is it to be abused. The exceptions do but prove the rule, as every good employer will readily admit; the pity is that such confidence should be ever abused, whether by the individual workman, or by those in whom the highest trust is placed, either in commerce, trade, or government.

§ 14. Whatever evils exist in connection with day-work, they are rather of a moral than of an economical character; a higher tone must pervade society as a whole, before workmen can be expected to be governed solely by a sense of duty; and yet this is the one thing needful in the relationship between employers and employed. The master who has the welfare of his work-people at heart, will be repaid by their gratitude, care, and devotion to his interests; neither time nor materials will be wasted, and the prosperity of both will be promoted, because the one is dependent on the other, and the misfortune of one will in a corresponding degree bring ruin on the other. The

relationship existing between employer and employed is too loose for any real sympathy to be evoked, the one tries to get all he can for his money, the other strives to obtain the most he can for his work; here they stand like two wrangling disputants, the one a mere buyer, the other a mere seller, both higgling over the price; whereas they should be co-partners, each aiding the other in the production of articles for sale, which, when completed, should be of mutual advantage to both, and of service to the community. If political economy could do something towards reconciling these apparently conflicting interests, it would confer a great service upon mankind; instead of which it has been guilty of developing the very cause which has led to these disastrous results. This has not been the intention of its teachers, but the doctrines taught have borne these fruits, nevertheless.

§ 15. It is asserted that it is only by some method of payment by results, that employers can secure an adequate return for their capital, by preventing waste of time, which means increased cost of production; and also, that it is necessary, in order to enable them to estimate accurately the probable cost of the article which they are engaged in producing, or of a large contract job for which they have tendered a price. If this were absolutely true, in the sense in which it is often stated, there would be some reason for introducing a universal change from day-work to piece-work, wherever possible and as soon as practicable. But it is only a partial statement of the truth, and it implies certain charges which are in themselves sad, in proportion to the ingredients of truth contained in them. The supposition seems to be that workmen generally, when engaged on day-work, will do as little as possible, utterly regardless of the results to their employer. Few employers would be hardy enough to state this, in all its nakedness; in reality it is, nevertheless, implied.

§ 16. There is too much reason to fear that honest and conscientious work is one of the great wants of the age; but this surely does not apply only to those who live on weekly wages; such a thing as honesty is to be found, even in the ranks of those who have to live on less than £300 a year; probably there is no greater waste of time in a factory or workshop than there is in a counting-house, or in a Government office; in each and every

case it is equally discreditable, and equally injurious in its consequences. This want of honesty is no less conspicuous in the case of the speculator on 'Change, the merchant in his office, the trader in the mart, or the manufacturer in the factory, than it is with operatives in the workshop; a general laxity seems to pervade all classes—if the workman skulks, the employer cheats, neither day-work nor piece-work is exempt from its pernicious influence; the contagion seems to have spread to such an extent that it has reached others besides the workmen, for examples of its effects may be found in all classes and grades of society, and in all professions.

§ 17. If, in day-work, the journeyman is slothful, in piece-work he is inclined to scamp his work; it is just the same with the manufacturer or trader; if he cannot compete with another engaged in the same trade, by making sound and good articles, he will supply shoddy, he will, if he can, adulterate his wares, even at the risk of poisoning his customers. It is useless to say that these are exceptions, the Adulteration Acts furnish one answer, others equally pertinent could be given; such examples of dishonesty are not one whit less numerous, in proportion to their numbers, in the ranks of the trading classes, than they are among those of the working people.

§ 18. Mr. Thomas Carlyle and Mr. John Ruskin, whatever may be said of some of their teachings in other respects, have done good service to poor struggling humanity by calling the attention of all classes to this, the greatest of all needs, namely, the conscientious discharge of duty in every sphere of life; to the necessity of honest and earnest work, no matter what that work may be. When, as a nation and a people, we have learnt this lesson, the difficulty about day-work and piece-work will have come to an end. Meanwhile, let those who are the most deeply and directly interested in the labour problem, adjust their differences in a fair and equitable spirit, always bearing in mind that both employer and employed have interests at stake which can only be settled by mutual concession and friendly arrangement, for their common benefit; and that in proportion as these matters are so decided, so will the industries of the nation prosper, and the condition of the people be improved.

II.—HOURS OF LABOUR.

§ 19. During recent years there has been a growing tendency in all trades and industries, to insist upon a reduction in the hours of labour. There is scarcely an extensive commercial or mercantile establishment in which the number of working hours have not been reduced, either on each day of the week, or on some special day, such as Saturday. Early closing associations have for years been actively at work, and the beneficial results of their action may be seen in the streets of all the great cities and towns of the kingdom. It was usual at one time to argue that if the young men and women in the retail establishments were released at an earlier hour of an evening, the time would only be spent in senseless conviviality, or frivolous amusements which would tend to degrade and not elevate the employés. How far these predictions have been verified or otherwise by the changes effected, is a question to be decided by those who were the opponents of the early closing movement; the promoters of early closing are unanimous in their testimony in favour of the reduction of working hours, so much so that the movement has spread to almost every industry in the kingdom. The Saturday half-holiday is fast becoming general in all large establishments, and where that is at present considered impossible, some firms close earlier on Wednesday or Thursday, so as to give their employés an equivalent for the longer hours on the Saturday. In addition to the Saturday, or other half-holiday, the shops are now closed one or two hours earlier every day in the week, and few firms would care to return to the late hours, which some few years ago were general throughout the country.

§ 20. But it is not alone in the large wholesale, retail, and other establishments that this has been done; in city offices, shops and small firms, and similar places of business, the office hours have been reduced considerably, greatly to the advantage, as well as the convenience, of all engaged therein. Excessive work, whether from long hours, or from overwork while engaged in it, is disastrous morally and socially, as well as mentally and physically, and at the same time, by its exhaustive process, it really diminishes the productive power of the worker. It is

often said that "it is the pace that kills," and so it is, but when pace and time are combined, it is like burning a candle at both ends, its power of resistance is lessened every minute it burns.

§ 21. Few men capable of forming an opinion will deny that the reduction of working hours has been attended with the happiest results, not only to those employed, but also to those who are in the position of employers. It not unfrequently happens, however, that those who favour shorter hours in the counting-house, the office, or the trading establishments, deny that the same beneficial results will follow if shorter hours were extended to the working classes. Brain-work, they say, is exhausting, mental application is depressing, and therefore the fewer the hours that they are employed, the more intense they can labour while they are at it.

§ 22. There is much truth in this contention, but it is equally applicable to all kinds of labour, in a greater or less degree, according to the nature of the work, and the physical strain on the worker. It must be remembered that a nominal day of ten hours does not fully represent the actual day to a great portion of the artisans and mechanics employed in this country. In the Metropolis a building operative has to be at his work at six o'clock in the morning, and he now leaves at five o'clock in the afternoon. But he has often to travel four or five miles to his work, so that he has to leave home at five, and cannot reach home again until six, making a total of thirteen hours. It is impossible to avoid these long distances between the home and the work; if a workman attempted to do so, he would have to change his place of residence half-a-dozen times a year. The same thing applies to most of the larger industries of the country. This is the reason why so many live in crowded courts, near the centre, so as to avoid long walking distances. Early trains and tramcars have been started to meet the difficulty, but these cannot run everywhere, and therefore, useful as they are in many instances, they do not remedy the evil except in special cases.

§ 23. An hour's walking is often very exhilarating to a business man, shut up in an office all day, but to a mason, carpenter, bricklayer, or plasterer, or other workman, who has

frequently to plod through rain or drifting snow, it is painfully exhausting, especially when it has to be done before six o'clock in the morning. Few persons perhaps will be disposed to question this, but if the reader should be so inclined, let him try the feat, and he will be all the more ready to admit that there is at least some excuse for the demand for a short working day. It is easy enough for a man who goes to his office at ten o'clock in the day to moralise over the depravity of people to want to leave work at five in the afternoon, but most of these people have been hard at work for at least three hours before the moralist has left his home.

§ 24. It would almost appear from the tone of some captious critics that nature had fixed upon a ten-hour day as the true natural limit for the workman, below which he ought never to go. That this was not always the case the history of labour abundantly shows. One of the first things which the labourers and artificers did when the chains and fetters of feudal servitude were struck from them, was for those who had escaped from the bonds of serfdom to begin work late in the morning and leave early at night. It is reported of an Irishman, when his master asked him how he proposed to make up for the loss of an hour at night, if the shorter day was conceded, that Pat's ready reply was: "Sure and I don't know unless you take off one in the morning too." When the artificers and labourers took it into their heads to work less hours, the masters, being then the law-makers, had this powerful remedy at hand: an Act was passed in the reign of Henry VI. (8 Hen. VI. c. 8) to compel labourers and artificers to come to work before five o'clock in the morning, and not to leave off till between seven and eight o'clock in the evening, from the middle of March to the middle of September. During the rest of the year they were to work from sunrise to sunset, and any one asking or taking more pay for working on holidays than the wages of ordinary days should be liable to three months' imprisonment, with hard labour. Here was a direct violation of the natural laws of political economy and the freedom of contract; but this was done by employers.

§ 25. By the 11 Hen. VII. c. 22 this law was re-enacted, and it was provided that there should be half an hour for break-

fast, half an hour in the afternoon, and an hour and a half for dinner and sleep, from the middle of May until the middle of August, and during the rest of the year there was to be one hour for dinner only. In 1515, by the 6 Hen. VIII. c. 3, the law was revised, and fines were imposed for skulking. But even this it appears did not put an end to the skulking propensities of the Saxon, for we find that the subject was again the matter of legislation in the reign of Elizabeth (5 Eliz. c. 4), when the meals and resting-time were again fixed, and they were in no case to exceed two and a half hours per day, and fines for skulking were fixed at one penny for every hour's neglect, not to exceed 6*d.* per day, the masters being empowered to deduct the fines from the wages.

§ 26. By striking an average between the long days of summer and the short days of winter, we shall find that the average working day all the year round was about ten hours, it is easy therefore to see that this supposed "natural" day of ten hours was the result of parliamentary enactment. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the skill of the workmen had greatly improved, and the productiveness of labour had increased, various methods were resorted to for the purpose of prolonging the working day. The noontide nap was first dispensed with, then other intervals of rest were curtailed, and ultimately artificial light was introduced, which had the effect of abolishing the difference between the short days of winter and the long days of summer, thus equalising the working day throughout the year, but extending it to the longest limit.

§ 27. The opening of the nineteenth century was signalised by a new cry, namely, for a reduction in the hours of labour; this was in consequence of the introduction of female and child labour into the factories, and the deterioration of the workers as a result of excessive overwork. In the olden times, during the darkest days of feudal tyranny, women and children were to a great extent exempt from the forced labour which men and cattle had to perform; but with the dawn of the labour-saving appliances of modern civilisation, women and children were utilised as a means of increasing production, and at the same

time decreasing wages. The overwork of the young, and particularly the excessive hours in the factories, became such crying evils that in 1801 the first Act was passed to restrict the hours of labour for apprentices, who were thereby prohibited from working more than twelve hours a day, between six a.m. and nine p.m., and provision was made for teaching them to read and write, and for other educational exercises.

§ 28. That Act further provided that the mills should be whitewashed at least once a year; and that doors and windows should be made to admit fresh air. The Act was followed by a series of commissions and committees of inquiry, the result being that it was several times amended. The details of the evidence, given before the several commissions and committees of inquiry, are sickening in the extreme, the medical testimony was unanimous in its verdict that children were being physically ruined by overwork; those who escaped with their lives were so crippled and maimed that they were unable to maintain themselves in after life, and thus became paupers. It was proven that out of 4,000 who entered the factory before they were thirty years of age, only 600 were to be found in the mills after that age. By Sir Robert Peel's Bill in 1819 it was proposed to limit the hours to eleven per day with one and a half for meals, for all those under sixteen years of age. The millowners thereupon prophesied the ruin of the manufacturers of the country—they could not compete, they alleged, with the foreign markets; it was an interference with the freedom of labour, the spare time given would be spent in debauchery and riot; and that if passed, other trades would require the same provisions. The Bill was defeated, the hours being fixed at seventy-two per week, and the justices, that is to say the manufacturers, were entrusted with the enforcement of the law.

§ 29. In 1825 a new law was passed, defining the time when breakfast and dinner were to be taken, and fixing the time to half an hour for the first repast, and a full hour for dinner; the traditional term "apprentices" was dropped and the modern classification of children and young persons was substituted, the children being once more prohibited from working more than twelve hours a day. But every means was adopted to evade

the law, as will be seen by the preamble to the Bill of 1833, which says: "Whereas it has become a practice to employ a great number of children and young persons, of both sexes, an unreasonable length of time, and late at night, and in many cases all night," etc. This distinctly points to the evasion of the law by the millowners and to the dire necessity for further intervention by the legislature. After thousands of petitions, and numerous angry debates in parliament, the Act of 1833 was passed, which limited the working hours of children to forty-eight hours per week, and provided that each child should have a certain amount of time for attending school, and factory inspectors were appointed to enforce the law. But the law was not to come into operation until March 1, 1836, during which time it had to be explained and defended in one session, amended in a second, and made binding in a third. After several Royal Commissions, and inquiries by select committees, the Act has been amended and extended, until the working hours of children are now limited to six per day, and for young persons and women to fifty-four per week, these provisions with certain modifications being now extended to workshops. The whole law was consolidated and amended in 1878. The tendency of modern legislation has been to throw the mantle of protection around children, young persons, and women, in the matter of the hours of labour; that which was denied by manufacturers, has been made compulsory by the humanity of parliament, in spite of the opposition of some Members of the *laisser-faire* school of political economists, in the alleged interest of women. The whole series of the Factory Acts, dating from 42 Geo. III. c. 73, in 1801, to the 41 and 42 Vict. c. 16, 1878, forms a code of legislation, in regard to working people, unexampled in any age, and unequalled in any country in the world.

§ 30. Outside parliament, efforts have been and are constantly being made to further reduce the working hours; the builders' lock-out of 1859, was the retaliation of the masters for the demand for nine hours; subsequently the engineers, the masons, and other trades agitated for a similar reduction, and the miners have been generally successful in establishing an

eight-hour day. The resistance of employers to any further reduction in the number of working hours is general in nearly all trades. They will, at all times, more readily concede an advance of wages, than submit to a reduction of hours, although the former may be equivalent to the latter, in so far as the actual money value is concerned. The reasons are obvious. In every case, a reduction in the number of working hours is almost always permanent, whereas wages may fluctuate; moreover, with a reduced working day must ever come, sooner or later, an increase in wages relatively to the time worked. This is inevitable; the employers know it, and hence their opposition. The workmen only dimly perceive this, and consequently do not always understand the reason for such obstinate resistance to a reduction of the hours of labour. For these, and many other reasons, working men, if they were wise, would never mix up the two questions of time and wages in their disputes or strikes; they ought to be kept separate and distinct, each being dealt with on its own merits.

§ 31. A curious feature in connection with this question has never been publicly noticed, namely, that there has been a constant yearning amongst working men for an eight-hour day. At their anniversary dinners, beanfeasts, and drinking-bouts, when they so far forget themselves as to indulge in the latter, there is one toast which at all times is enthusiastically responded to, namely: "The four eights; eight hours' work, eight hours' play, eight hours' sleep, and eight shillings a day." This seems to have originated out of King Alfred's division of the twenty-four hours into three parts, eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep, and eight hours for improvement and recreation; this dream has been running through the history of labour for centuries, as an aspiration, longed for, hoped for, and to be worked for. It has in it a reminiscence of the old guilds, only that, in later times, the fourth eight has been tacked on to make it rhyme. Through all the vicissitudes of labour struggles, this aspiration has survived, and whenever an attempt is made to secure it, a hearty sympathy is evoked, and a ready response arises in the breasts of working men. It was so when the eight-hour law was passed in America, and it found an utterance in

Europe, in the several congresses held by that now defunct institution, the "International."

§ 32. The preceding pages were written in 1877, and represented the actual phase of the question at that time. The Continental sections of the "International" were in favour of an eight-hour day, and they sought its enactment by law. The English members were not less in favour of an eight-hour day, but they sought it by and through their unions. The former looked to the State, and legislative enactment, to initiate and carry a measure, fixing by law the hours of the working day; the latter, relying upon their unions, initiated movements for the reduction of working hours, each tending more and more towards the eight hours' limit. With that independence and self-reliance which has ever distinguished the British workman, he has endeavoured, by individual exertion, and by associative effort, to effect a reduction of the hours of labour, in all the trades of the country. During the thirteen years which have elapsed, what has happened, what progress has been made? Which of the two parties has effected most in this direction in the interval? On the continent of Europe, very little has been accomplished, even as regards the working hours of women and children, and as respects the working hours of adult males, they are as they were. Continental workmen are still looking to the State to help them. They rely upon the State. They do not comprehend what is meant by self-help, and associative effort, as these agencies are understood and applied by British workmen. The organisation of industrial forces, for practical purposes, is to them but a figure of speech. They think our methods slow, and ineffectual; they never seem to realise the fact that, if slow or ineffectual, we move, and we move forward, whereas they move in a circle, that is, if they move at all, which, in so far as this question is concerned, is doubtful. What have they attained in the matter of legislation respecting labour? Are their factory and workshop Acts equal to those in this country? Do the adult males work fewer hours? Are the general conditions of labour better? These questions are pertinent in face of the fact that, at the International Congress recently held in this country, the foreign delegates endeavoured

to force legislative action upon English representatives, as the only way of solving the labour question.

§ 33. In the long series of persistent efforts put forth by British workmen for the reduction of the hours of labour, they have hitherto trusted to combination—to associative effort, through their unions, to curtail the working day, and by degrees to reduce it to the limit of eight hours. In no period of their history, in none of the struggles in which they have engaged, have they relied, or attempted to rely, upon legislation; ever tending onward to the object of their desire and their hopes, an eight-hour day, they have striven to gradually reduce the hours, first in one trade, and then in another, until, in a large number of very important industries, the working hours are 54 per week, or, taking one day with the other, only nine hours per day on the average. In many trades the average is even below 54 hours per week, ranging from 53 to 48½ hours per week. In some trades the eight-hour day has been obtained as the recognised standard day. In the great coalfield districts of Durham and Northumberland, the miners work less than eight hours, the length of the shift being from 6½ to 7½ hours, from bank to bank. Within the last twelve months, the gas-stokers, in many localities, have secured an eight-hour day, as the recognised fixed hours of labour in that occupation. The details with regard to working hours are given pretty fully in the Third Report of the Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade, issued in 1889, the figures in which show that a substantial reduction of working hours has been effected within the last twenty years, by associative effort, through the action of trade unions. Combination has thus achieved, in numerous instances, what Continental workmen sigh for, and vainly seek to obtain, by State aid, and Municipal regulation.

§ 34. British workmen as a rule were opposed to legislative enactment for regulating the hours of labour, and conditions of work. They were not opposed to legislation for the protection of life and limb, or for ensuring proper sanitary conditions in the workshop. They supported legislation for the protection of women and children, and aided the factory operatives in their action to secure the Factory Acts, and all reasonable

efforts to extend the provisions of those Acts to other industries, and to workshops where women, young persons, and children were employed. But they hesitated to apply such legislation to adult males. Indeed it was a rare thing for any man to advocate the extension of factory legislation to industries where adult males only were employed. Their efforts were quite in the other direction. They sought rather to undo the vicious legislation of the past, by repealing the Acts of parliament bearing upon, or affecting labour. What they claimed was the right of combination, the freedom to associate together for mutual protection and assistance. This granted, they felt that they had the power to decide for themselves as to their rates of wages, hours of labour, and conditions of employment. Hence their long continued and ultimately successful struggles to repeal the Master and Servant Acts, and the remnant of the old combination laws, and also to abolish the conspiracy laws in so far as they had been applied to labour disputes. The workmen's victory was virtually achieved in 1875 by the passing of the Labour Laws, although they did not, and do not, regard that victory as absolutely complete. The faults in those laws, however, are less of an enacting character than of administration, the provisions being often interpreted by a reference to other statutes, passed in former times, when the conditions of employment were altogether different, and when free combination was not possible, because it was illegal.

§ 35. The demand for legislative enactment, in regard to the hours of labour, is of recent date. It was practically unknown a dozen years ago. It has originated mainly with men inexperienced in labour movements, and almost wholly unacquainted with the history of labour struggles. In reading or listening to their speeches one is amazed at once by their ignorance and their impudence. With the sole exception of a few miners' representatives, no trade union official or "leader" of repute among the working classes has taken any part in this new craze for an Act of parliament day. The miners' representatives are careful to explain that they limit their demand to an eight-hour day for miners, as being an exceptional

occupation. Not so the "Socialists." They declare for a universal eight-hour day, first of all for employés in Government establishments, and those employed by Municipal and Local Authorities; then for miners, and for such other industries as may be selected in detail as the most promising for attack. If an eight-hour day is to be enacted at all, their position is the most illogical. To legislate for classes, or for sections of the community, has been over and over again condemned by working men as a vicious policy; whether they are now going to inaugurate a new "reign of law" based upon class legislation, remains to be seen. The chief trade unions of the country have pronounced against it, and it is condemned by all their experienced leaders. The movement for an Act of parliament day of eight hours is mainly supported by the Socialists, many of whom do not belong to what is usually termed the working classes; by the labouring population, who have hitherto had very little or no organisation, in the shape of unions, to help them; by the miners in certain districts where trade unionism has been generally at a low ebb; and by a comparatively small section of the older unionists scattered up and down the country. It must, however, be admitted that the movement is growing, and it might so spread among the unionists of the country as to become an element of danger, politically, socially, and industrially, at no distant date. The May-day demonstrations did not forecast that danger, and the Hyde Park demonstration, on the 4th of May, was to some extent reassuring, as the resolution passed at the meetings of the latter did not commit those present to the method by which the eight-hour day was to be attained. Nevertheless, enthusiasm is catching, and the sympathy of numbers operates as a powerful influence in public life. The advocates of an Act of parliament day of eight hours are active and zealous, and many of them are not over-scrupulous, either as to methods or means. The agitation might therefore lead to industrial and political complications, the extent of which it is difficult to foresee. The formulated proposals at present consist of: (1) An eight-hour day for miners; (2) A demand for an eight-hour day for all persons employed under Government, or by Municipal and

Local Authorities; and (3) an early closing day for shop assistants. These are but the initial steps.

§ 36. Meanwhile there is a vigorous movement going on for shorter hours in the various industries of the country. Some of the demands made throw a side-light upon the eight hours agitation. In many trades the workers insist upon the eight hours as a normal day's work; and in some cases they have won it, or are on the way towards winning it. Among railway employés it is demanded as a matter of public safety, as regards signalmen, pointsmen, and others upon whom devolve great responsibility, affecting life and limb. Other trades limit their demand to nine hours, to ten hours, or to twelve hours, as the case may be. These demands show that those employed in the various industries recognise the practical difficulties in the way of a universal eight-hour day by Act of parliament. These varying demands really cut the ground from under the feet of the Socialists, by whom the several movements are now and again supported. Perhaps, when they have the time, they will undertake to formulate a measure in which the whole trades of the country shall be scheduled, each separate trade having its legal day fixed, according to its needs. They must either do this, or stick to eight hours for all workers, of whatever class or occupation. Taking female workers, by way of example: would not domestic servants be equally entitled to protective law as shop-girls; or barmaids as milliners? What hours should the slavey in the kitchen have, or an "ironer," or a washerwoman? An Act of parliament, to be just, must be adjusted to all sorts and conditions of work-people, otherwise it confers "privileges," which is unjust law. Past legislation has halted, and has had to halt, in its best efforts to throw its shield over women and children, because of the inherent difficulties of the question. But it has usually gone in the right direction—cautiously, timidly even—in extending its operation to workers not previously embraced within its scope. A single false step might undo much of the good which has been already accomplished. Hasten slowly is a good motto in legislation at all times; it is scarcely less wise in matters of everyday life. Shorter hours of labour are becoming more and

more a necessity of modern industrial life. Every wise effort in this direction deserves support, and will command it. The opposition of employers of labour to a reduction of working hours is less fierce than formerly. The general public are more in sympathy with a short day and full pay than they were a few years since. And the feeling is spreading, and will spread, if prudence holds firmly by the helm.

§ 37. An extremely strong case will have to be made out before the House of Commons will undertake to legislate upon it by the enactment of an Act of parliament eight-hour day. No such case is made out, nor has it been even attempted. One industry has been specially selected to commence with, namely, the miners. But no sufficient reason has been given for inaugurating special class legislation for the mining population as regards the hours of labour. Of all men in the country, the miners are best able — to their credit be it said —to take care of themselves. In the two counties of Durham and Northumberland they have practically secured less than an eight-hour day. In other districts the miners can effect, by combination and organisation, such reductions in the working hours as the nature of the industry will allow, the local circumstances admit, and as the men may require. What has been done by the miners in the districts mentioned can be done by miners elsewhere. The eagerness for legislation is of very recent growth. When the Mines Regulation Bill was before parliament, in 1888, an attempt was made to raise the age at which boys should go into the mine, but the miners did not support the proposal. Legislation for the protection of children is defensible; for adult males it is not required, except for safety to life and limb, and other cases provided for in the Mines Regulation Act.

§ 38. The case of Government employés is still less defensible. They have little to complain of in the matter of long hours, and less probably as regards the laboriousness of their work. Some of the recent parliamentary reports seem to show that hard continuous work is the exception, rather than the rule, in Government yards, factories, and workshops. The returns, as to overtime, presented to parliament in 1886, 1887, 1888, and

again in 1890, seem to show: (1) that they are not overworked; and (2) that they are quite willing and even anxious to work longer hours, provided that they are paid in proportion. If an eight-hour day is wanted as a means of getting higher wages by making more overtime, at higher rates, such as time and a half, or whatever may be the extra exacted, then it is equivalent to increasing wages by Act of parliament, a policy not to be tolerated for a moment. To some extent, the proposal that Municipal and Local Authorities shall reduce the working hours all round to eight per day is equally open to objection. The majority of those who have to pay the taxes, and the rates, will have just cause to complain that their representatives vote the nation's or the people's money for the purpose of advancing wages, when those who pay not only get no kind of benefit by the transaction, but are more heavily taxed or rated in consequence. The policy is not a sound one, industrially or financially.

§ 39. The question as to conditions of employment, other than working hours, is not here discussed. The remarks upon the subject are wholly restricted to the hours of labour. If personal safety and health are put forward as reasons for legislation, it is doubtful whether even the miners can claim the first place. In many respects, signalmen, pointsmen, and some others employed on railways, can present a stronger case. The engineers employed at collieries have also a strong claim; and so have blast-furnacemen, and other iron and steel workers, on account of the intense heat to which they are subjected, and the laborious character of the work. Signalmen and pointsmen, and, in a lesser degree, colliery-enginemen, have the lives of others in their keeping, so that they may well plead urgency on the grounds of public safety. Certainly, employés under Government, and those under Municipal and Local Authorities generally, cannot urge equally strong and substantial reasons for legislative interference with the hours of labour of adult males. The question is not whether eight hours are sufficient for a day's work, but whether that limit shall be fixed and enforced by law. Were it to be so fixed, provisions would have to be inserted to prevent overtime, except in cases of great emergency, sufficient in their character to be pleaded in justification for so working,

in a court of law. Are working people prepared for such legislation? Will they submit to the regulations of a State bell or gong which shall imperatively sound the minute of commencing and leaving off work, like hired slaves?

§ 40. One important aspect of this question must not be left untouched in considering this matter of the Eight Hours Bill. It is often said that the men could work fewer hours if they desired so to do, because, being paid by the hour, they are able to fix their own time of working. This is not the case, as every man at all acquainted with industrial life knows. This fact, however, is not of importance here. The special point too often lost sight of is that the more leisure a man has, the more money he requires to be able to use that leisure advantageously to himself and to others. Any reduction in wages, therefore, approximating to the value of the reduced working hours, would be disastrous; consequently it is usually stipulated, or contended that the wages shall remain the same, notwithstanding any decrease in the hours of labour. Speaking generally, wages cannot be reduced without injuriously affecting trade, for the working classes constitute the mass of the consumers in all countries. Increased leisure, to be of any benefit to the workers and to the community, must be accompanied by a higher standard of living; and this is only possible with higher wages, and more regular employment. The latter, it is urged, will result from an eight-hour day. Doubtless, to some extent it will. But the amount of wages is the determining factor in all conditions of industrial life. Wherever the men can by combination effect a reduction in working hours, there the circumstances will be suited to the change. The eight-hour day is a noble aspiration, and worthy of the best efforts of the people to attain. We only demur to its being made the subject of legislative enactment.

III.—SYSTEMATIC OVERTIME.

§ 41. A good deal of unreasonable abuse is often heaped upon trade unions, because of their opposition to what is termed overtime, that is, working beyond the ordinary or fixed day,

whatever that may be; whether of eight, nine, or ten hours. There is no use whatever in having a fixed day, if the men systematically work beyond its limit; and hence, in order to check the practice, and, if possible, effect a prohibition, they exact an extra price per hour, for all the time worked beyond the customary day. Overtime may be regarded under two heads: (1) systematic and general, that is, habitually working more than the fixed day; and (2) occasional or partial overtime, in cases of emergency. In the former case, the reasons that may be urged against it are numerous: (1) It destroys the fixed working day, which is no less beneficial to the artisan and labourer, than regular office hours are to the merchant and the clerk. If there be no fixed time when the day shall begin and end, a workman can have no regular hours, and his work will be necessarily spasmodic and irregular; whereas with a fixed working day, he knows what he has to do, and is able to arrange his work and make provision accordingly, as to the way in which he will spend his leisure hours. Few things are more disastrous in their effects on a man, than irregular hours; this is so well known in commercial life, that the office hours are usually rigidly fixed, the times being posted up for the information of all customers.

§ 42. Irregular hours are not less injurious to workmen than they are to the trading classes; if the hours are not fixed for the operatives, they cannot well be fixed for the clerks who are employed, or for the foreman, and to a certain extent not even for the employer. Generally it is conceded that the working day shall consist of a certain number of hours, and that ordinarily the day's work shall not exceed the fixed limits. In certain trades, however, a habit has grown up of working constantly and systematically beyond those fixed limits; and hence, any reduction in the length of the working day, only enhances the price of labour for every hour worked beyond that limit. Indeed, in many cases, the journeymen only look upon a reduction in the hours of labour as a means of adding to their wages, by increased pay for overtime, which they are quite as willing to work, as the employer is to pay for the labour.

§ 43. This practice is not fair to employers, inasmuch as work performed after the usual hours is never so productive as that which is done within the fixed and limited day. Most employers are fully alive to this fact and seldom encourage it. If workmen only desire a reduction of the working hours, in order to add to their income by working overtime, the pretence of wanting additional leisure for self-improvement and recreation, and to enable them to reach their houses at a reasonable hour in the evening, is but a hollow sham; a far better plan would be to ask for more wages at once. Some unions are fully aware of this tendency on the part of workmen, and of their own members, that they therefore prohibit the practice altogether. The "greed for overtime" is less conspicuous with employers than with the employed, but the blame for extending the hours of labour, in this direction, must be shared by both.

§ 44. The advantage of systematic overtime is not ultimately greater to the workmen, than it is to the employer, for while the latter loses in actual value, the former does not gain in absolute profit; if he works later, he spends more, and the habit of stopping to "take a glass," on the road home, is proverbially common with systematic overtime workers. Moreover, they frequently lose in the morning the hour which they worked overnight, and hence they are not only not benefited, but are often losers by the transaction. Even if they worked steadily and constantly, it only proves that, in so far as they are concerned, the ordinary working day is too short, and that the outcry against the excessive number of hours, which they were called upon to work, is not justified by the facts.

§ 45. Looking at it from every point of view, systematic and general overtime is not beneficial either to workmen or employers, it is not a blessing to the giver, or to the receiver, but a curse to both. The unions which strive to prohibit it are conferring a benefit on their own members in the first instance, and, in the second, on the masters by whom they are employed; and lastly, they contribute to the social welfare of the artisan classes, and thereby add to the happiness of the entire body of the people.

§ 46. (2) Occasional, or partial overtime, in cases of emer-

gency, is quite another matter. Whenever this is actually required, workmen, as a rule, are ready to comply with the wishes of employers. There may be instances in which, at an inopportune time, men have refused to work beyond the hours fixed as the ordinary day, but they are not sufficiently numerous to affect the conclusion that workmen usually comply with the employer's wishes. In some occupations, however, it is a common practice to encroach upon the men's time on all possible occasions. As a means of resistance to this, and also in order to protect the stipulated day, it is customary to demand extra pay for all hours worked beyond the ordinary limit. Nor can this be considered unreasonable, when it is recollected that more money has been spent in an endeavour to reduce the hours of labour than for any other purpose. If employers really want men to work overtime, it surely is not more unreasonable to tax his pocket, than it is to tax the strength of the workmen. After all it is a very simple matter, too small seriously to dispute about; a little common sense, and kindly forbearance, on both sides, would at all times be quite sufficient to settle the whole question, both as to payment, and the extra time to be worked. If an overbearing employer, and an obstinate workman, too ignorant and wilful to consult each other's interests, will persist in disagreeing about trifles, the matter is personal to themselves; in such cases it is quite unworthy of public discussions in the press and elsewhere.

§ 47. It is impossible to ascertain, or even approximately to estimate, the amount of overtime worked in the various and numerous industries of the country. That it is systematically worked to an enormous extent is well known to those who are at all acquainted with the usages and conditions of industrial life. But it is extremely difficult to obtain reliable statistics, or well authenticated facts sufficient to arrive at any definite, accurate, and well founded conclusions upon the system, as applying to the entire trades of the country. In many industries systematic overtime is so customary, general, and continuous, as to warrant the statement that it is normal in these branches of trade; in others it is resorted to whenever there is the slightest spurt or extended activity in trade; in some it is worked more

irregularly and spasmodically, but so frequently as to become systematic, averaging it over any considerable period of time. During the last two years overtime has been the general, not to say the invariable rule, in nearly all the trades which have participated in the revival of industrial activity, after the prolonged depression through which the country has passed. But overtime is not confined to periods of prosperity. It is worked very generally even when trade is dull, when thousands are out of employment, as some figures to be quoted will show.

§ 48. In the year 1886, the writer moved for, and obtained "a Return, showing the total number of men employed in Woolwich Arsenal, and in the Small Arms Factory at Enfield, in each Department and branch of trade, and the extent to which systematic overtime had been worked during the two years, 1884 and 1885, and the two first months of 1886, and the number of men working overtime."* This Return was continued by further Returns in 1887 and 1888, bringing the figures down to date.† In the present year another return has been granted, bringing the figures down to March, 1890.‡ These important Returns, covering a period of six years, show the extent to which systematic overtime is worked in Government factories, and may indicate the amount of time so worked in trading firms and establishments, though in a varying degree, all over the kingdom. The Returns are limited to four Departments; but there are reasons for believing that the practice is prevalent in other Government establishments, in some instances possibly it is even extended in its character and operations. The following synopsis of these Returns reveals the pernicious extent to which it is carried, even where no actual pressure exists for the practice, as might be the case in the event of war, or rumours of war involving speedy preparations.

§ 49. The Departments included in the Returns are: The Royal Carriage Department, Laboratory, Gun Factory, and the Small Arms Factory. The aggregate number of men and boys

* Woolwich and Enfield Factories, No. 120, April 19th, 1886.

† Woolwich and Enfield Factories, No. 180, June 14th, 1887; 206, June 7th, 1888.

‡ Woolwich and Enfield Factories, No. 201, June 5th, 1890.

employed was 12,390. Of these 1,811 were lads and boys; 216 were foremen; 38 were timekeepers; 225 were writers and draughtsmen, making a total of 2,290. The remainder consisted of 2,722 engineers, fitters, etc.; 222 boiler-makers, shipbuilders, and moulders; 460 wheelwrights and joiners; 73 masons, bricklayers, and painters; 2,047 other and subsidiary trades; and 4,576 labourers; total 10,100. The average weekly number of men employed in the four Departments in 1884 was 7,446; of these 794 worked 548,568 hours overtime. In 1885 the average weekly number employed was 10,254; of these 7,760 worked 4,832,950 hours overtime. In January and February, 1886, the average weekly number of men employed was 11,605, while the total number who worked overtime was 6,267, and those worked 601,139 hours overtime. The state of things disclosed by these figures is this: In neither period was the normal strength of the Departments reached. The aggregate number employed is given as 12,390. In 1884 the total number employed on the average was fewer by 4,944; in 1885 by 2,136; and in 1886 by only 785. The largest number working overtime was in 1885, when the Departments were below the total strength by 2,136.

§ 50. The actual number of hours worked as overtime was as follows: In 1884, total number of hours, 548,568 by 794 men; in 1885, the total was 4,832,950 by 7,760 men; in January and February, 1886, the total was 601,139 by 6,267 men. These figures give an aggregate total of 5,982,657 hours, or nearly 6,000,000 hours of overtime in two years and two months in these four Departments. The average weekly number of hours worked per man, of the total employed, was in 1884, in the only two Departments so working, 3·1 and 5·3 respectively; in 1885 the average for all the Departments was nearly 9 hours, and in January and February, 1886, the average was 7·1 per week. But, taking the total number of those who actually worked overtime, the averages were from 9·4 to 17·8 hours per week in 1884, in 1885 nearly 13 hours per week, and in January and February, 1886, they rose to 27·6 hours per week. These averages would be still higher if the number of weeks when overtime was worked were taken into account. In the foregoing

summary night shifts are excluded. The total number of hours so worked in 1884 was 7,433 hours; in 1885 the total rose to 39,795 hours, and in 1886 to 44,296 hours. The more serious point in connection with the working of nearly 6,000,000 of hours overtime, in the period covered by the Return, is that, during that time, thousands of skilled men were walking the streets of London seeking work, and finding none. Meetings of the unemployed were held weekly in Trafalgar Square, and other open spaces in the Metropolis, demanding that work should be found by the Government, or by the Local Authorities, or failing that, relief was demanded. The hours worked overtime during that period of depression, extending over only two years, and two months, would have given employment to about 1,000 men, at fifty-four hours per week, for the entire period. Taken in connection with the demand for an eight-hour day, it would seem that the first step to be taken is to abolish the practice of systematic overtime, if employment is to be found for those unemployed, as urged by the advocates of the eight-hour day.

§ 51. In consequence of the motion for, and the granting of this Return, and of questions addressed to the Secretary of State for War upon the subject, there was a considerable reduction in the number of hours so worked; but the practice was not discontinued, it was simply restricted in its operation, in comparison with 1884, 1885, and 1886. The extent of systematic overtime from February, 1886, to March, 1890, comprising the last four years, will be seen by the following summary of the three last Returns. The average number of persons employed weekly during the four years was 11,486; in no year was the number up to the full standard of the establishment. Of the total, the yearly average number of men who worked overtime systematically weekly was 1,758. Those men made a total of 1,506,208 hours in the whole period, or an average of 376,552 hours yearly. The average number of hours overtime worked weekly, varied in the several Departments. In the Royal Laboratory, the number ranged from $3\frac{3}{4}$ to $13\frac{3}{4}$ hours weekly, the average being $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours. In the Carriage Department the hours ranged from nearly 6 to nearly 13 hours, the average

being nearly 9 hours. In the Gun Factory the overtime was pretty regular, at about 5½ hours. In the Small Arms Factory, overtime varied from 3·1 to 10·32 hours, the average being nearly 8 hours per week. In all the Departments the overtime worked was 8½ hours per man in 1886–7; in the next year 20 hours per man, in the following year 26¼ hours per man, and last year 29½ hours per man weekly. In the year 1884–5 and 1885–6, every four men displaced, by the overtime they worked, one man from full employment all the time; in the last four years the average overtime worked weekly per man was 21 hours, so that every five men displaced two men from full employment during the whole period.

§ 52. The question arises, who are responsible for this practice of systematically working overtime in Government establishments? The authorities at the War Office assert that the workmen are chiefly responsible for the system of overtime; some of the men allege that the pressure so to work comes from the foremen. The point is not very material, as the foremen are not far removed from the workmen in social position, or even in wages. Possibly both parties are to blame, and each, therefore, should share the responsibility for the systematic prolongation of the working hours beyond the normal limit of the recognised ordinary working day. Whoever may be in fault, it is a practice to be checked, and discontinued wherever practical; for excessive working hours are now being almost universally condemned by all classes of the community. If the workmen are pressed to work overtime, they may plead some excuse, as a refusal to do so might be used to their disadvantage. If, however, the pressure comes from the workmen, or they willingly concur in the practice, then they deserve more severe condemnation, because it tends to show insincerity with respect to the eight hours as the normal limit of the day's work. It is their duty to discourage overtime, and some of the unions recognise that duty by insisting upon extra payment for all time so worked. The concession of extra payment per hour ought not to operate as an incentive to any extension of the practice, but should operate in the contrary direction—as a means of contracting it, and even prevent-

ing it, wherever possible without inflicting injury upon employers or trade.

§ 53. The preceding facts and figures refer solely to, and the remarks are also confined to, systematic overtime. In the foregoing observations occasional overtime is altogether excluded from consideration, because it occupies a totally different position. A workman would be a churl if, in case of necessity or urgency, he refused to work an extra hour, and particularly when he is rewarded by extra pay for the time so worked over and above the ordinary rate of wages. It would appear that the unions have great difficulty in checking the practice of systematic overtime, even where the rules endeavour to prevent it. In the May report, 1890, of the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders' Society, a case is reported of a member who worked all day upon one vessel for one employer, and all night upon another vessel for a different employer, thus putting in twelve days in the week, instead of six. Whether the labour performed was satisfactory to the employer, or beneficial to the man, is not here the question. This might be an extreme case; it shows, however, not only a willingness, but a greedy desire, to put in all possible time on the part of some workmen. The reports of the last two years indicate that systematic overtime has been general and continuous in most trades where industrial activity has been the rule. The obvious conclusion is that workmen like it, and will work overtime whenever they can, the rules of the union to the contrary notwithstanding. Nevertheless, the practice is a bad one, and ought to be discouraged. Looking at it from every standpoint, the conclusion is that systematic overtime is not advantageous to the employer, is not permanently beneficial to the workman, and is injurious, in its ultimate effects, to the general community, especially to the working class. If an eight-hour day were ever enacted for grown men, stringent provisions would have to be added to prevent overtime, except in cases of absolute necessity.

CHAPTER VII.

TWO PHASES OF TRADE UNIONISM: I. COERCION, INTIMIDATION, AND RATTENING. II. PICKETING, CONSIDERED IN ITS LEGAL, POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND PERSONAL ASPECTS.

I.—INTIMIDATION.

§ 1. When this work was first published scarcely a week passed without some allusion in the press, or by public speakers, to cases of alleged intimidation, in one form or another, of non-union workmen, by trade unionists.* Under these circumstances a clear statement of the facts with regard to the whole class of "offences against the liberty of the subject," with especial reference to the personal freedom of workmen to work where and for whom they please, may be of some service both to employers and workmen, and not altogether without interest to the general public. In order to do this fairly we must draw a line between acts which are positively unlawful in themselves, and which must be put down by the strong arm of the law by whomsoever committed; and "picketing," which may or may not involve undue influence or coercion, either in itself, or by attendant circumstances, and which, therefore, must be treated independently as separate and apart from actual intimidation. The first part of the subject will first be dealt with.

§ 2. A good deal of misapprehension has existed, and even still exists, with regard to the alleged coercion of non-unionist workmen, by trade unionists. This was intensified by the

* As these phases of unionism have not entirely disappeared, this chapter is retained. The bitter attacks formerly levelled at the unions have, however, ceased.

Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, by reason of the mal-interpretation of the word "coerce" in section 1 by the magistrates and judges before whom the several cases were tried. This was clearly pointed out to the Home Secretary, Mr. Bruce (now Lord Aberdare), at a deputation to the Home Office, on March 21, 1872, by the then Parliamentary Secretary of the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee, in the following words: "The other term 'coerce,' as used by the Act, appears to mean 'induce,' and not what it is ordinarily supposed to mean, 'compel.' Surely this was never intended by the Government when draughting the Bill." The Home Secretary nodded assent.

§ 3. Coerce, as defined in the dictionaries, means "to restrain by force, to compel;" it involves compulsion, or force of some kind, other than moral suasion. Had the term been so construed by our courts of law, the objections urged against the use of that term would not have been valid on the part of trade unionists. This was stated over and over again in public meetings, in deputations, in memorials to Ministers of State, and in petitions to parliament. Notwithstanding these constant iterations and reiterations, a certain section of the press, and many public men who were opposed to every kind of concession, repeatedly accused the unionist workmen of seeking, by Act of parliament, for the power and the means by which to coerce their fellows by compulsion or force. The accusation is even now repeated sometimes in journals of a special class. It is satisfactory to be able to add that, in the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1874, section 7, the word "compel" has been substituted for "coerce," so as to prevent as far as possible any further misconstruction in courts of law of a word that has been so variously and technically interpreted. After this emphatic recognition by the legislature of the justice of the demands made by the workmen, it surely ought to be no longer necessary to protest against continual misrepresentation of the views of trade unionists even by a section of the press and of the public; the repetition of these allegations is, however, too frequent to be passed over without some definite disclaimer on the part of workmen.

§ 4. It may serve as a caution to those who persistently misrepresent working men, by reminding them that the safest way in all such matters is first to ascertain precisely what the demands of the workmen are; and, secondly, the reasons for those demands, before attempting to denounce the men who are deputed to seek for a modification or repeal of statutes, which, for centuries, were enacted in the interest of a class, and that class not those who get their living by daily labour, but employers, by whom also those laws were too frequently interpreted, and administered.

§ 5. The fundamental objection against the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, as stated in a memorial to the Home Office in March, 1872, was, that it was "founded upon the presupposition of criminal intentions on the part of that large section of Her Majesty's subjects known as trade unionists," who, it affirmed, "were as peaceably disposed as any other portion of Her Majesty's subjects, and were as opposed to any violation of the letter or the spirit of the laws of the land, either openly or secretly." It further stated that this wrongful supposition of the legislature "was in itself an act of injustice to members of trade unions, caused by imperfect knowledge as to the aims, objects, and working of these societies." It was urged that every species of intimidation, whether by individuals or in combination, was fully provided for by the general statute and common law, which dealt with ordinary cases of assault; and specially by the Offences against the Person Act, 24 and 25 Victoria, c. 100. These representations did not stop here; in a letter addressed to Mr. Gladstone, on July 12, 1873, it was stated that if it were found that those laws were insufficient to prevent molestation or intimidation, either by individuals or in combination, the general statute law should be so strengthened as to reach all offences and offenders, in any and every such case.

§ 6. This view was ultimately adopted by the legislature in 1875, by the repeal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, which was a special enactment against a class; and by the substitution of a law general in its character and its application, not levelled at unionists as a body, but directed against the person or persons who perpetrated the offence. The legis-

lature in this case was but fulfilling one of its most obvious functions—namely, providing for the liberty and freedom of every individual in the State, and the prevention of every species of molestation or tyranny, in so far as it is possible to do so by Act of parliament. Every right-thinking man, whatever his political or social creed, will aid in maintaining such laws against the lawless few, who might seek to evade them.

§ 7. It would be altogether unnecessary and superfluous for an Englishman to protest against acts of personal violence, were it not for the fact that a numerous class of British workmen have been accused of aiding and abetting those guilty of the grossest violations of law and order, and indeed of outrages and crimes the most atrocious and abominable. Whole pages could be filled with extracts from newspapers and speeches, published between 1867 and 1877, in which cases of outrage and violence, committed by a few brutal and ignorant men, were attributed to a whole class, the aid of the legislature being invoked for the avowed purpose of putting down, not the outrages, but the unions, by whose authority, it was alleged, these outrages were committed. If the object had been to punish the offenders, all would have concurred in the reasonableness and even need of such legislation; but when it was found that its ulterior object was the suppression of the unions, the interference was resented, and resisted, by associations of workmen all over the country.

§ 8. In consequence of inflammatory articles in the newspapers, and the speeches of a few men in parliament, a general impression prevailed in 1865, 1866, and 1867 that gross personal violence and outrages were part and parcel of the organisation of trade unions; and that the only way to repress such outrages was the suppression of the unions, by the re-enactment of the old combination laws, with penal provisions even more stringent, severe, and thorough than any of those which had been repealed. This feeling was so widely spread that the comparatively little band of men who, in and out of parliament, were labouring for a modification of the law, as it then existed, were assailed with every kind of vituperation and abuse. "They ought to be hung up at the nearest lamp-post,"

the writer once heard a "gentleman" say. "The unions must be stamped out as a public nuisance," said a well-known London daily newspaper.

§ 9. Confident in the conviction that these accusations were unjust and false, and that any commission of inquiry would prove them to be so, the leaders of the unions demanded a full and fair inquiry into all the alleged outrages. Before the appointment of a Royal Commission had been asked for in parliament, the London trades, on October 26, 1866, sent a deputation into districts where outrages had occurred to inquire into them, and to report thereon. The deputation failed to discover any connection between the outrages and the unions; but they did ascertain that rattening was resorted to, by some few of the Sheffield trades, although it had, at that date, very much diminished.

§ 10. On October 29, 1866, the Town Council of Sheffield resolved to send a deputation to the Home Secretary, "to urge the appointment of a commission of inquiry into the cause or causes of the explosion in Hereford Street." At the following meeting of the Council, Mr. Alderman Saunders pointed out that, "by the terms of advertisement with regard to the deputation, they were to solicit the Secretary of State to inquire also into the working of the general system of trades' unions. He wanted to know whether the deputation from that Council were going to exceed their powers by asking for any such general inquiry, because that would be a question open to very grave discussion, and it was not justified by the resolution of the Council passed at the previous meetings." The Mayor stated, in reply, that "the deputation of this Council must confine itself entirely within the resolution. It must not go beyond that, and I believe it will not."

§ 11. The Home Secretary appointed Tuesday, November 13, for the interview; the London trades, on November 6, requested the Sheffield Town Council to allow a deputation from their body to accompany the deputation on the 13th. This was refused, but the Home Secretary consented to receive the London deputation on Saturday, November 17. One important fact in connection with these deputations deserves to be recorded—

namely, that the first, consisting of the leading employers of Sheffield, was intentionally a private interview, reporters were not admitted, and the report given by the Mayor, at the following meeting of the Town Council, was so meagre and unsatisfactory that it was strongly condemned by Mr. Alderman Saunders and Mr. Alderman Ironsides, the former declaring "that secrecy, in a matter of such public importance, was unwise and underhanded, and that it was not honourable or straightforward;" the latter stating that "wherever there was secrecy there was corruption, and that the affair was a miserable one, and the sooner it was forgotten the better." In the case of the second deputation, the Home Secretary refused to admit reporters, although expressly requested to do so; but a tolerably full and complete report was furnished to the newspapers. This open straightforwardness on the part of the London trades was warmly eulogised in the Sheffield Town Council by the members above named.

§ 12. The Government resolved to ask for the appointment of a "Royal Commission to Inquire and Report on the Organisation and Rules of Trades and other Associations, with power to investigate any recent acts of intimidation, outrage, or wrong, alleged to have been promoted, encouraged, or connived at by such trade unions or other associations." The powers given to the Commission by the Trade Union Commission Act, 1867, enlarged by the Trades Union Commission Act Extension Act, 1867, were practically unlimited, and it is fortunate that they were, for by no other means could they have unearthed the dastardly outrages which were subsequently brought to light. It is unnecessary to go into the details of outrages shown to have taken place at Sheffield and Manchester; suffice it to say that they sent a thrill of horror through every grade of society; and to none were they more sickening than to the vast majority of trade unionists, who were appalled, both by the number and the enormity of the crimes. For a time the leaders of the unions could but watch and wait; the evils attributed to trade unions, by their most implacable foes, had been more than realised. The question was, when and where, they would end? Those deeply interested awaited day after day, with feverish

anxiety, the result of each fresh investigation, lest any other thing should come to light not dreamed of by the active leaders and supporters of the unions. Ultimately it was found that the cases were limited to Sheffield and Manchester, and furthermore that, even in these districts, they were confined to a few only of the trades. The final Report of the Commissioners was thereafter looked forward to with greater confidence; it was felt that the whole system had been laid bare, and that the great body of the unionists of the country had passed through the ordeal without a stain.

§ 13. In the public mind "rattening" is frequently confounded with personal violence and outrage, but it is nothing of the sort. To those who are not acquainted with the meaning of the term, the following explanation, as given by Mr. John Wilson, of Sheffield, for many years a strong opponent of trade unions, may be offered:

> When a workman has given offence to the society connected with his trade, either by working against the rules or not paying his contributions, it has been the custom in Sheffield with a few societies, say three or four, to take away at night the bands or nuts from his wheels, to prevent his working until the contributions are paid or the rules complied with.

Mr. Wilson admitted, in 1866, "that the practice had greatly diminished of late years." The deputation who visited Sheffield stated "that it was found that some of the employers had admitted, and others countenanced, the practice, as the best means of making the men comply with the rules and regulations of the societies;" to such an extent was the practice winked at in the town of Sheffield. Rattening, as defined by the Report of the Royal Commission, is "the abstraction of the workman's tools, so as to prevent him from earning his livelihood until he has obeyed the arbitrary orders of the union." It is satisfactory to know that this system, like the atrocious crimes before alluded to, was chiefly confined to Sheffield and Manchester, and that, even in those places, it was seldom resorted to at the date of the Commission, and then only by a few trades in these districts.

§ 14. So little was the practice known, or believed to exist, outside the particular localities named, that members of trade

unions generally discredited the rumours and reports as to the practice. By the majority of workmen rattening was regarded as little better than stealing, and as such, to be punished and put down by law. Hence the leaders of the unions frequently replied that the law was surely sufficient to punish the offence. But if, as it was alleged, the law was insufficient to meet this particular case, they urged the strengthening of the Malicious Injury to Property Act, 24 and 25 Vict. c. 97, so as to reach what ought to be a crime if it were not. This also was clearly pointed out in the letter to Mr. Gladstone, before referred to. In no instance can it be proven that any of the leading unionists ever countenanced a practice which was "an utter perversion of all sense of law and duty," as expressed in the Report of the Commissioners. It cannot be too emphatically stated, that all acts in contravention of law and order are great blunders, as well as great crimes against the body politic, and that the man or men who are guilty of gross violations of the law, are the worst enemies of the unions of which they are members, and of the class to which they belong.

§ 15. With regard to the general results of the searching inquiry to which trade unions were subjected, during the years 1867, 1868, and 1869, the testimony of one of the Commissioners is the best evidence. In a speech delivered on April 21, 1869, Mr. Frederic Harrison said he "congratulated the workmen of the country on the fact that outrages were found to exist in only two places—Sheffield and Manchester; and the Commission, in their Report, did not recommend any exceptional legislation on this matter, though Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Merivale, and Mr. Booth were the most determined opponents of trade unions." In another speech, on May 28 of the same year, Mr. Harrison said, "the charges brought against the members of these societies had in the main broken down during the inquiry by the Royal Commission. The great bulk of the unions had passed the ordeal without a stain."

§ 16. In the Report of the majority the following paragraph (No. 50), is important:

> One observation, however, we feel it necessary to make, leaving out of the question grosser cases of outrage, and confining our-

selves to the more ordinary cases of vexatious interference with the workmen's liberty which have been brought before us, it must be noticed that very nearly the whole of these instances rest on the testimony of the employers; the workmen themselves, those on whom the alleged tyranny presses, have not come forward in any numbers in answer to our general invitation to substantiate them. As far as the workmen are concerned, if we accept the evidence of numbers of the *Free Labour Registration Society*, a body organised for the particular purpose of counteracting the trade unions, few complaints of the present influence of trade unions, and no suggestion for the curtailment of their power, have been brought before us. No independent and insulated workmen have volunteered to express themselves in that sense. This may be interpreted either as implying that the labouring classes in general are not discontented with the restrictions which the trade unions appear to impose on industry, or (as we believe) as implying that the influence of those unions is so very extensive, and their ramifications so minute, and the general dislike to oppose an established class feeling so strong, that the real sentiments of the workmen opposed to the union have been, to a great extent, withheld from us.

§ 17. A moment's consideration will show that the former reason was the real one, and not the latter. When the Royal Commission was appointed, and during the time of their investigation, the public feeling against trade unions was so intensified that workmen who, for various reasons, were dissatisfied with their power, or who resented their interference, would have gladly availed themselves of the opportunity of retaliating upon the unions which had, by their restrictive action, imposed conditions upon independent workmen to which they were opposed. Every workman who had belonged to a union, but had been expelled for misconduct, those who had been fined for breaking the rules, and non-unionists who had a grievance, would have been only too glad to have had an opportunity of exposing the alleged tyranny of the unions, had any real and substantial oppression existed. And the unions would have been powerless to have resented any such evidence, had it been forthcoming. Moreover, it appeared, from the tone of the speeches of the movers and seconders of the Address, in both Houses of Parliament, that there was an intention on the part of the legislature, or at least the Government, to curtail

the power of the unions, so that every inducement was held out to discontented workmen to produce evidence against the unions, if they had any actual and material grounds for complaint. The fact is, there was no such feeling on the part of non-union workmen; hence the failure of the Commission to obtain sufficient evidence to enable them to propose any legal curtailment of the power of the unions.

§ 18. The Trade Union Act, 1871, which directly resulted from the inquiries of the Royal Commission, was in many respects a great advance upon all previous legislation in favour of workmen. But the right of a workman, who was at the same time a unionist, to address another workman, who was a non-unionist, or who happened to be employed during a strike, was positively curtailed beyond anything contained in the Acts for which the Criminal Law Amendment Act was to be substituted. This matter will be referred to more definitely in dealing with picketing, but in general terms it may be said that the new law was more stringent than the old which it repealed. In the opinion of workmen the law in itself was unjust, and its administration was marked by exceptional severity. Under these circumstances a good deal of sympathy was manifested towards those prosecuted under this law, not because the law-breakers were justified in their conduct upon all occasions, but because the punishment awarded was often out of all proportion to the offence, and was inflicted, or at least so it appeared to the unionist workmen, with the view of terrifying those who were members of trade unions.

§ 19. This policy was a mistaken one from beginning to end. Men who had really broken the law, not in the letter only, but in the spirit, were often regarded as being persecuted; they were treated as martyrs, for the simple reason that, in effect, the law was directed against a class, instead of against the offences of lawless men who were actually guilty. The mistake committed in 1871 was not repeated in 1875; in this respect the Labour Laws, enacted in 1875, were an immense advance upon all previous legislation, and especially upon the enactments of 1869 and 1871, remedial as both of these measures were in some respects.

§ 20. The legislation of 1875 has produced the happiest results in the interests of law and order; for a good deal of the irritation of the past was caused by the repressive laws by which workmen were tried and punished. They have been in operation for fifteen years; notwithstanding their leniency as compared with former laws, the prosecutions have been but few, and the need for such prosecutions is daily diminishing, and will diminish year by year. The history of the operation of repressive enactments supplies a lesson which masters and workmen may study with advantage, and which it is the duty of both to learn.

§ 21. It may be asked: do unionist workmen never overstep the legitimate bounds of liberty and law? Do they never intimidate, molest, or obstruct those who are opposed to them, or work contrary to their wishes, or to the rules of the union? The answer must be in the affirmative—they do; but experience shows that the sympathy expressed for those who go beyond the law, as it now stands, is almost *nil* as compared with what it was under the old law. Facts could be adduced, and instances given, in proof of this, were it necessary. One or two may be mentioned. (1) One of the oldest, and for some years the largest, and best organised trade unions—the masons —had a case before the council in 1876. A strike had taken place in Bristol, when the members of one of the lodges resorted to intimidation; the employer thereupon sent to the executive of the union, explaining the circumstances of the case; they at once sent down one of their trusted members to investigate the facts. He met the men, and denounced their conduct, and strike pay was refused. A prosecution was instituted against the ringleaders, but was withdrawn on their pleading guilty. The union stood by the master, against their own members, because they had exceeded the law. (2) In another case a prosecution was instituted against some workmen in London. Under ordinary circumstances the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Congress, or the London Trade Council, would have defended the men. They did not. Why? Because, although the men denied the having used the expressions attributed to them, they could not, or did not,

refute the evidence given against them at the trial. Many other cases could be cited. Even better evidence is, however, to be found in the improved tone and conduct of the workmen whenever there is a strike.

§ 22. It must be remembered that there are nearly a million and a half of adult males in the trade unions of the country, and therefore, if some cases of intimidation occur, it is not fair to hold the entire body responsible, by whom generally the act is repudiated and denounced. Wholesale denunciations of a class, because of the lawlessness of a few, must ever be unjust and unfair, and they tend rather to increase the evil than to repress it. From the foregoing observations the following conclusions may be drawn: (1) Measures of repression and suppression are seldom effectual for the purposes which their enactment had in view; methods of evasion will be found which, in the long run, will be as mischievous, and equally to be deprecated, as the acts committed in themselves. This was evident during the existence of the old combination laws; to some extent the experience was the same under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871. It will ever be so when attempts are made to strike a blow at a system, through a law designed to punish individual offenders; moreover, it deserves to fail, for in its nature it becomes persecution rather than vindication of law and order which are intended for the public good. Employers sometimes say: "Strike —but hear;" workmen reply: "Strike at offences and offenders, as much as you please, and all good, honest, and law abiding men will aid in the administration of such wholesome laws." (2) Workmen also should learn this salutary lesson—that no man has a right to interfere with the freedom of another. The man who attempts to do so commits a blunder greater than he can estimate, and he violates a law which it is the interest and the duty of all alike to observe. The workman who interferes with the liberty of another workman, in the exercise of his undoubted right, puts into the hands of the class above him a weapon, with which they will be able to chastise him as with scorpions, for, in the long run, law will prevail over lawlessness. The man who violates a just law will not only receive punishment for the breach of such law, but will deserve it—first, for breaking

the law itself, and secondly, for setting an example of intimidation, which his conduct has taught others to use, who may be able to intimidate with comparative impunity.

§ 23. The riots and consequent loss of life, in connection with strikes in America, Austria, Germany, France, and other countries, furnish additional evidence, if it were needed, in support of the fact, that the more complete and compact the organisation of labour is, the more effectual is the discipline which it exercises over its members, and, as a necessary result, the less liable are its members to indulge in acts of violence or excesses of any kind when disputes arise between workmen and employers in regard to wages, hours of labour, or other objects sought by the union. The contest may be prolonged and obstinate when conducted under the auspices of, and governed by, a strong and well-regulated trade union, but it is certainly more orderly and less lawless. The whole of the plans and methods of action adopted by a properly constituted trade society are systematic and clearly defined, and therefore the conduct of the men engaged in the strike is not so tumultuous and turbulent, as it is when they are not under the control of a powerful organisation, the moral force of which exerts an influence over the wildest and most violent of its members, and represses, with an authority which they cannot resist, any tendency towards lawlessness or revolt. The weapons of their warfare are in the one case moral, in the nature of restraint; and material, in the shape of funds and combination of numbers: in the other outrage and crime are resorted to as a means by which to accomplish their ends, because they are subject to no sufficient executive check at the outset of their industrial battle. It is even so in war; the excesses of a regular army are never so cruel or ferocious as those of irregular troops.

§ 24. It is the duty of the law to protect all alike, and to punish those who attempt to interfere with the personal liberty of another, whether by threats, coercion, intimidation, personal violence, or other overt action, and no mercy should be shown to those who are guilty of such offences. The law should be equal for all, and universal in its application and enforcement, without regard to person, position, or class. In all its main

provisions such is the "Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875," for which reason it should be upheld and obeyed by all classes of workmen, both in and out of the union.

§ 25. With regard to rattening, cases have been reported which seem to show that it is not altogether abandoned at Sheffield. It is no use mincing the matter, the practice could be stamped out if the Sheffield police did their duty. By whomsoever committed, rattening is a crime—call it what you will, robbery, thieving, or stealing a man's tools—it is an offence against the law, it violates the rights of property, and is repugnant to all sense of duty, right, and freedom.

§ 26. A moral responsibility rests upon those who are opposed to this species of terrorism, to aid the police, where they can, in the detection of the criminals; if they do not, they morally become accessories to the crime, and may be in danger of being held legally answerable for the wrong done, just as much as those who actually committed the deed. If a man secretly connives at offences of this description, and in public holds up his hands with a kind of pious horror when they are discovered and brought to light, he is more than ever guilty of culpable complicity, for, in addition to having already participated in them, he adds thereto the sin of hypocrisy, by assuming a virtue and an innocence which he does not possess. It is high time that these malpractices were put an end to; they are a disgrace to the age in which we live, and a scandal to the cause of unionism, which no one with a grain of common sense can palliate or excuse.

II.—PICKETING.

§ 27. Picketing is very often represented as combining, under one term, all the elements of positive coercion. With reference to the past it may be truly said that the honours, or dishonours, were pretty evenly divided as regards undue influences, the workmen using the grosser forms of personal interference, and the masters a more covert one, but none the less real. Picketing, however, is a weapon used by the workmen only; it is very frequently resorted to in the event of a strike,

or lock-out; it is disliked and condemned by employers, justified and practised by the men; it is constantly discussed in the press, and is often the subject matter of a prosecution in our courts of law. The question is therefore of sufficient importance to entitle it to independent treatment, apart from the several matters mentioned in the preceding pages.

§ 28. Many persons are under the impression that picketing is the cause of outrage and violence, and the means by which they are effected and perpetrated. This is a gratuitous assumption; experience has proved quite the contrary; the abuses of this method of industrial warfare are exaggerated, both as to their number and character; and further, the evils sometimes associated with the practice are not necessarily incident thereto.

§ 29. I. The first question to be put, and clearly answered, is—What is picketing? The following definition is given in the report of the Royal Commission, 1869, clause 68: "Picketing consists in posting members of the union at all the approaches to the works struck against, for the purpose of observing and reporting the workmen going to or coming from the works, and of using such influence as may be in their power to prevent the workmen from accepting work there." If the word "dissuade" had been used instead of "prevent," this definition would have been a tolerably accurate one; as it is, the case is overstated, or rather, it presents a phase of it which is repudiated by the better organised bodies of associated working men.

§ 30. The following statement, as to the nature and objects of picketing, is submitted as a correct representation of the practice, apart from the abuses which sometimes arise in connection therewith. (1) It means that, when a strike has taken place in regard to any particular master, or firm, one or more men, technically called "pickets," are told off to watch the works, to see that no strangers are taken on, without being first made acquainted with the fact that there is a dispute with that particular employer, or firm, and to give information to such strangers as to the nature and causes of the dispute. These pickets are usually workmen who had been, previously to the dispute, in the employment of the employer struck against; these are generally taken in rotation, as their names appear on

the "strike-list." They are allowed a little extra pay per day for the days on which they are so engaged, the average and usual extra pay being from 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.*, according to the society to which they belong. In cases, however, where there is difficulty in obtaining the required number, they are paid more, but such instances are exceptional.

§ 31. (2) The duty of pickets is to endeavour to see every workman brought to the works, or who applies for employment; to persuade, if possible, such strangers not to enter into an engagement to work, and to induce them, if they can, to join the ranks of those who are on strike.

§ 32. (3) The pickets are authorised to state to those who apply for work, that the union will be prepared, in the event of their refusal to work after the explanations given to them, to reimburse any expenses to which they may have been put in coming to the town or place, and also their expenses back to their homes, or, if they prefer it, to some other place in search of employment. And further, they are usually empowered to offer a gratuity, by way of compensation for loss of time, or to aid them until they can find work elsewhere.

§ 33. (4) If these strangers or non-union workmen consent to this course, they are taken to the committee, or officers of the union, who have full power to deal with each case on its merits, as to expenses incurred, or the hardships to which any individual has been exposed. The men are reasoned with as to the nature of the strike, its cause, its objects, and the probable effects upon the men if lost, and also the anticipated benefits to them, if it be won. In all this terrorism, or threats, are the last things thought of, as they would be utterly futile, and would absolutely fail in their object. Resistance to the dictation of the union, instead of compliance with the requests of the union men, would be the result, if such a course were pursued, and the future chance of such men joining the union, which is always an object of the unionists, would be frustrated, and often rendered well-nigh impossible.

§ 34. II. The object of picketing is undoubtedly to dissuade non-union workmen from taking the places of those on strike. But it is not necessarily a system of terrorism, to

prevent men from accepting work, if they think proper to do so. It is not by coercion, but by persuasion or contract; not by intimidation, but by argument, that these ends are sought. The man who goes beyond the legitimate bounds of moral suasion, not only runs the risk of breaking the law, and thereby incurring its penalties, but he endangers the very objects which the union, and he as a member of it, have in view. It is admitted that merely "obtaining and giving information" do not cover the whole of the objects sought by those who use picketing as a means for the attainment of the end in view; but clearly, it ought to be shown that the object, or the means, or both, are unlawful, before any attempt should be made to put down the practice by legislative enactment. If a system is to be suppressed because evil consequences sometimes arise, let it be tried in connection with the grog-shops and public-houses of the country; here, surely, we can trace cause and effect with a vengeance; but those who are the first to demand the suppression of picketing, would be the last to acknowledge the right of the legislature to lay the axe at the root of the evil, in regard to consequences arising out of the sale of intoxicating liquors. A code of morals cannot well be established by Act of parliament, but offences committed either in contravention of law, or against public order, come within the scope of legislative enactment.

§ 35. III. The abuses which occur in connection with the practice of picketing are thus stated in the Report of the Royal Commission, clause 69 :

> It is alleged that instructions are given to the pickets to confine themselves to a mere representation of the case of the union promoting the strike, and to use argument and persuasion only, without resorting to violence, intimidation, or undue coercion. But although such instructions may be given, it is hardly in human nature that the pickets, who are interested parties, and who are suffering the privations incident to a strike, should always keep within the fair limits of representation and persuasion, when dealing with men whom they see about to undertake the work which they have refused, and who may thus render the strike abortive. Accordingly, experience shows, and the evidence before us leaves no doubt on our minds that, during the

existence of a strike, workmen desirous to accept work are often subjected, through the agency of the pickets, to molestation, intimidation, and other modes of undue influence, and in effect are prevented from obtaining employment.

§ 36. If the word "sometimes" had been inserted in the place of "often," the above paragraph would have represented more accurately the true facts of the case; as it is, the conclusion is somewhat strained. That this is so, is well known to those who have any considerable experience in trade and industrial disputes; but it is not so obvious to those who, like the members of the Royal Commission, have to rely upon the evidence given, where qualifying circumstances are frequently omitted, or upon exaggerated reports, published in newspapers.

§ 37. The sweeping charges contained in this paragraph of this report, were hardly justified when we consider the admissions made in the clause (50), reprinted towards the end of Part I. § 16. It is there stated, that "few complaints of the present influence of trades unions" had been brought before the Commission, and these had been given by persons who were interested in presenting the worst phase of unionism. But the reasons for the conclusions of the Commission, and of the alarm in the public mind, are easily explained. Hundreds of strikes, with the usual practice of picketing, occur, to which public attention is never drawn; they are not of sufficient importance to attract a crowd of reporters anxious to chronicle every fact which tells against the workmen. Such strikes sometimes result in favour of the men, at other times in favour of the masters; picketing is resorted to in most cases, but the public hear nothing about the alleged evils of the system. Why? Because they seldom take place. But let one single instance of coercion or undue influence be resorted to, and the entire newspaper press will record the fact, not unfrequently colouring it so as to distort its real nature and significance (or rather insignificance); "leaders" are written in denunciation, not only of the actual perpetrators of the offence, but of the whole class to which they belong, until it becomes a settled conviction in the minds of the majority of the public, that these cases are perpetually recurring; that they form part, an

essential part, of the system, and are the absolute and necessary outcome of the practice. That this conviction on the part of the Commissioners was an honest one, no one can for a moment doubt; and it is equally honest on the part of those who still believe that terrorism by unionists is constant, persistent, and inevitable, and that it forms a part of their code of written or unwritten law. But, surely, it must be conceded that those who deny such allegations are also honest, and that their denials are entitled to some consideration, and their pledged word to some respect. All the honour and all the truth are not confined to the "other" side.

§ 38. IV. In clause 70 of the Report the following "grounds of objection" to the practice of picketing are given:

> So far as relates to members of the union promoting the strike, the pickets cannot be necessary if the members are voluntarily concurring therein; so far as relates to workmen who are not members of the union, picketing implies in principle an interference with their right to dispose of their labour as they think fit, and is, therefore, without justification; and so far as relates to the employer, it is a violation of his right of free resort to the labour market for the supply of such labour as he requires.

(1) In so far as the first paragraph relates to members of the union, who know of the strike, and its objects, it is correct; but union men are sometimes brought from a distance under the impression that no dispute has taken place, or exists; such workmen, as soon as they learn the facts, voluntarily refuse to accept the proffered employment. (2) With regard to non-union workmen, it would be true if the principle of interference, which is alleged that it implies, were exercised for the purpose of *preventing* the men from accepting work on the terms offered. In no other sense is it an interference with the right of men to dispose of their labour as they think fit. Moreover, it is precisely this class of workmen who need the information intended to be given, because, not being in union, they have not the means otherwise to acquire it. (3) With reference to the conclusion contained in the third paragraph, it only becomes a violation of the right of the employer, of free resort to the labour market, when the means used are in themselves objection-

able. If by coercion men are prevented, if by misrepresentation they are misled, if by pressure other than moral suasion they are made to refuse the terms offered by employers, then it is a violation of the rights of the employer, but not otherwise. Masters often use far more objectionable means to prevent workmen obtaining employment elsewhere. Good, able, and conscientious workmen have been driven from place to place in search of work, to be met not only with refusals, but insult, and at last have been compelled to break up their homes, and migrate to other places; in other cases, have been obliged to emigrate through the persistent persecution of employers. Why? Because these workmen were selected by their fellows to go to the employers as ambassadors, for the purpose of trying to arrange better terms for their labour. Many an agricultural labourer has been made a poacher, and subsequently a criminal, by such a system of persistent persecution. Others have terminated their misery by suicide. This practice of terrorism, on the part of the masters, is not confined to agricultural villages and small towns; its ramifications have extended far and wide, even in the higher departments of skilled labour in large towns.

§ 39. The attempt made by employers to introduce what is termed the "document system" was an effort to systematise, and render permanent and universal, the power to follow a workman from place to place, to set the mark of Cain upon him, and to reduce him to slavery or to beggary. The "document" drawn up by the employers, required their workmen to sign a declaration to the effect that they were not members of, and would not join, any trade union; and that if they were, they would cease all connection with it, and would not contribute towards the furtherance of any of the objects of such trade union. This document was numbered, and the counterfoil contained a corresponding number, together with the name and description of the workman; when he was discharged, or left his employment, the name was sent round to other employers in the trade, with a statement of the reasons for which he was discharged or left his work. This practice was enforced in the engineering trade for years, but its success was not encouraging, and it has now been practically abandoned, certainly in so far as the

question of membership, or non-membership, of the union is concerned.

§ 40. In 1859 the master builders of London attempted to introduce the system, and enforce its acceptance on the operatives in the building trades, but they failed. Much of the bitterness connected with the lock-out in 1859, and the subsequent strikes from 1860 to 1862, arose out of this unwise experiment on the part of the employers. They failed to establish the "document" as a permanent institution, but they nevertheless succeeded in preventing some of the "leaders"—that is, the delegates or members of the committee—from obtaining employment in any firms in the metropolis. So powerfully did this black list of the masters operate that some of these men had to leave London; others left the trade never to return to it again. Foremen, who knew their capabilities, would gladly have offered them employment, but they could only do so on the one condition of going in a false name. Even privation was better than this, and consequently, when they found that the London firms were closed against them, notwithstanding that the dispute had terminated, they sought fresh pastures, until the acrimony of the employers had passed away. It is now generally conceded that these "disbarred" and blackballed "leaders" were among the most intelligent, reasonable, moderate, and upright men of their class. Why, then, this prohibition? Simply for this reason, that they happened to be selected by their fellow-workmen to be members of the committee for conducting the affairs of the union during the dispute. Men are thus "spotted" and punished because of the accident of their position, not because they originated, or caused the strike, or used coercion or undue influence to restrain others from accepting work, but in consequence merely of having been elected to a post of honour among their fellows, on account of their intelligence, their capacity, and their character.

§ 41. Happily this feeling on the part of employers is rapidly passing away. It was necessary, at one time, on closing a dispute, to stipulate that there should be no martyrs—that those who had taken part in it, either as officers of the union or members of the committee, should not be treated as marplots

and agitators, and be discharged by reason of their official action during the dispute. But even when this was done, some pretext was not unfrequently found for getting rid of such men immediately after a settlement had been effected. It need scarcely be said that such pretexts can be easily found, if an employer determines to exercise his power of retaliation upon those whom he accuses of being the cause of the dispute. Employers, however, do not use this power to the same extent as formerly; they are beginning to learn the value and the necessity of conciliation, and that forbearance is better than severity; and also that the "leaders" are not, as a rule, the originators of strikes, but simply the "instruments" by which the unions conduct their affairs, when a strike has been resolved upon by the body to which they belong. Employers have learned that these "agitators" are often the most moderate men in the union, that they are opposed to strikes as a rule, and are often the last to give their assent to a strike when it has become inevitable. To punish those who act merely as the agents of the union is as unreasonable as it would be for a foreign potentate to punish the bearer of a disagreeable despatch or an ultimatum.

§ 42. V. Paragraph 71 of the Report states that:

> The abuses to which the system of picketing leads were made evident in a remarkable manner in the case of the London tailors' strike in the spring of the year 1867, when proceedings were instituted against some of the men who had taken an active part as pickets, or in organising the system.

§ 43. This case caused considerable commotion in London at the time, but in no sense could the overt acts then committed be construed as representing the actual practice of picketing. The conduct of the men in this particular strike was repudiated and reprobated generally by the trade unionists of London. In no single instance was the terrorism then exercised palliated or excused; nor was the inquisitorial nature of their proceedings justified. Whatever sympathy was manifested had reference to the members of the committee and officers of the society who were indicted for conspiracy; not because they had themselves been the offenders, but in conse-

quence of their being the officials of the union. If the men actually guilty of the offences had been proceeded against, such sympathy would not have been expressed. That this feeling was well founded is proven by the ultimate result of the trial; for, although they were convicted of conspiracy, under the then existing law, they were not sentenced, and on their promising that all kinds of coercion and undue influence should cease, they were liberated. It must not be supposed that this promise, and its subsequent fulfilment by the defendants, involved personal knowledge on their part that the instances of oppression, which undoubtedly did take place, were within cognisance of the members of the committee and officials who were prosecuted. But in order to prevent the possibility of a repetition, in the future, of the acts described in the evidence, all picketing was suppressed, and the pickets were withdrawn from the shops.

§ 44. If those only had been prosecuted who committed the offences complained of at the trial, and these had been punished, very little commiseration would have been felt for them. As it was, the employers went too far—they tried to put down a practice because some men misused it, and they failed; they aimed a blow at the union itself, through its officials, but in this they were unsuccessful. A somewhat remarkable fact deserves to be recorded in proof of the foregoing statement. The solicitors entrusted with the defence of these men were so impressed with the high character, the ability, and the honesty of the chief officer of the society, who was one of the principal defendants, that after his release they interested themselves on his behalf, and promoted him to a position of trust. At this moment he occupies an honourable place in the firm, in a profession thus opened to him by the generosity of those who were best able to judge of his innocence. Moreover, a learned judge, who had ample opportunities of knowing all the circumstances of the case, subsequently expressed his surprise that a conviction ever took place, as, in his opinion, all the facts were on the side of the defendants.

§ 45. VI. In the last clause of the Report, in regard to picketing (No. 72), the Commissioners say:

With the facts in connection with the tailors' strike, and the results of the trial in the Central Criminal Court before us, together with the mass of evidence appended to our report, we have no hesitation in expressing our opinion that the abuses which have been proved to arise out of the practice of picketing ought to be carefully and uniformly repressed.

Certainly, the abuses arising from the practice of picketing ought to be repressed, just as the evils arising out of any other practice ought to be suppressed. There are abuses arising out of the formation and floating of joint-stock companies, out of Stock Exchange speculations, bankruptcy arrangements, and pawnbroking; but the man who attempted a crusade against the entire system, because certain evils result from these "practices," would be deemed a madman or a fool.

§ 46. Carefully and uniformly repress abuses by all means, but do not visit upon a class the offences of individuals. At the same time it must be remembered that so long as a law is in existence it must be upheld and obeyed. If the law be in itself oppressive, men are justified in making efforts to amend it; but obedience to the law must be strictly maintained and uniformly enforced. There is ample evidence to show that this has been, and still is, the view generally held by reasonable and sensible trade unionists.

§ 47. In forming a judgment, however, upon cases which arise in connection with labour disputes one fact should be borne constantly in mind by judges, juries, and the public—namely, that the rough-and-ready expressions sometimes used by one workman to another must not be judged by the standard of the courtesies of the drawing-room, or even on the strict lines of those recognised in the counting-house or the office; many offensive words are unfortunately given utterance to in the workshop which would appear to imply intimidation or threats, but which, if judged by those current in the workshop, would not bear that construction, or be looked upon as more than ordinarily offensive; they certainly would not present that aspect of menace or force which a judge or jury might attach to them. Such words may have the appearance of being *in terrorem*, when in reality there is no meaning in them beyond the mere vulgar expression

of dislike for the course pursued by the person to whom they are addressed. All this is very reprehensible, but certainly not criminal, and in passing judgment due allowance should be made for the blunt and *brusque* language usual amongst workmen. This is not offered by way of apology for lack of ordinary courtesy or civility, but rather as an explanation, without which injustice might sometimes be unwittingly done, or undue severity be administered in a court of law.

§ 48. VII. The questions which arise are: (1) Is picketing necessary as a practice? (2) Is it useful as a means? And (3) Are the evils complained of inseparable from the system itself? (1) Picketing is no longer necessary in the sense in which it was before the general use of newspapers, for the obvious reason that notice can now be given by means of paragraphs or advertisements which will reach the remote corners of the United Kingdom in the course of a few hours; and, further, several of the leading trades have special facilities for circulating information throughout the entire country, through the branches of their union, which are in constant communication with the central office of the society, by means of their fortnightly and monthly reports. The fact is the system is giving way of itself; in some trades it is no longer resorted to, in others the more prominent members of the union discourage it, and hence it is doomed to die out, under the more enlightened policy of the legislation of the last few years. (2) Is the practice useful as a means, and is it advisable? Generally speaking the reply must be in the negative, for it seldom effects the object which the union has in view. If men are determined to accept work on the terms offered, all the pickets in the world will not stop them. Trade unions are voluntary associations of working men for special and specific purposes, and if, by their pickets or any other means, they transgress this voluntary principle, it is an infraction of the very principle of their existence, and a violation of the first element in their charter. Coercion ought never to form a part of their mode of procedure, or be used as a weapon in labour struggles. Under better conditions the practice of picketing will be discontinued; as this can only be effected slowly, and by degrees, it is desirable that its uses, as well as

its abuses, shall be clearly stated, so as to be understood by the public. (3) The last question has been practically answered in the preceding pages. The abuses of the system are not inseparable from its practice; but there is a danger lest some violent or ill-tempered man, in a moment of irritation, provocation, or passion, should, in the exercise of his own undoubted right, overstep the fair and just line of legitimate persuasion allowed by law, and thereby infringe the rights and liberties of another. This must be guarded against by all means; for this purpose the existing law, however leniently expounded, is ample to ensure perfect freedom to enable all to dispose of their labour as they think fit, and to punish those who molest others in the exercise of this right.

§ 49. VIII. Since the amendment of the law, by the "Labour Laws, 1875," several cases of importance have occurred, to some of which it is desirable that attention should be drawn. The chief, involving the whole law, are: (1) The engineers' strike at Erith; (2) The shoemakers at Bethnal Green; and (3) The bricklayers at Messrs. Doulton's in Lambeth.

§ 50. The first represented a phase of picketing which, even where no actual personal interference takes place, cannot be too strongly condemned; it was in fact a species of "mobbing," or something very nearly akin thereto. This is not necessarily a part of the practice of picketing, not even incidentally; it is merely one of the evils which occasionally arise in connection with it. Persons, not always members of the union, often not in any way connected with the dispute, sometimes congregate near the works of the employer whose workmen are on strike, and these persons, usually mere loungers, hoot, hiss, and taunt those who refuse to leave work, or who may be taken on after the strike has taken place. These stupid exhibitions of temper and feeling are to be reprobated and condemned; yelling and hooting are not arguments; they can never assist, but will ever retard any cause, however good; they serve only to inflame the passions of those engaged in the struggle, and render the solution more difficult. Under just, equitable, and salutary laws, these disorderly proceedings should be discontinued, for it is

not to be tolerated that the practice of picketing, if it be continued, shall be supplemented by an aggregation of force, in shape of numbers; or that persons shall be permitted to congregate around a workshop for the purposes of obstruction, which is only another name for force, by hooting, yelling, and jeering at those who choose to remain at work. To say the least of it, it is a blunder, more damaging in its results to workmen than it can ever be injurious to the employers.

§ 51. The second case tried at the Old Bailey did not involve a question of mere picketing, it was substantially one of threats to do personal injury; the defendants denied using the language attributed to them, but they were unable to prove their innocence, or disprove the evidence given against them at the trial, and hence they were convicted and sentenced to two months' imprisonment. The line of defence which the men took up was disastrous to them, for they endeavoured to throw a doubt on the statements of the witnesses for the prosecution by raking up matters of a private and personal character against them—in one case the misconduct was seventeen years previously, in the other more recent; but in neither were the subjects introduced germane to the question before the court. The attempt to discredit the witnesses in this instance only aggravated the offence, and possibly added to the punishment; at any rate it did not improve the position of the defendants, or redound to their credit, or that of their legal adviser.

§ 52. In the third case, picketing was not the grievance at Messrs. Doulton's works; no personal interference or obstruction took place, and the employers themselves bore witness to the general good conduct of the men whose duty it was, as members of the society, to picket the works. The employers declared that nothing was done by the pickets to which they could reasonably object, excepting in so far as they objected to the system itself, which, under all the circumstances, was but natural. They furthermore publicly stated that they had not been inconvenienced by the practice of picketing, for their works were filled, and the work was performed, by able and experienced workmen. What they complained of was the strike; the object and intention of which were regarded as unreasonable, and in effect mis-

chievous, not only to those concerned in the dispute, but to the cause of unionism. Every instance of intolerant interference with the freedom of labour reacts disastrously on those who promote it, and incidentally upon others not parties to the act itself. Few will deny that this particular strike was marked by folly from beginning to end; the object was bad, and at variance with the principle of individual freedom; the results were as unprofitable as the most ardent opponent of unionism could desire; and the effects upon the general public were as pernicious as they well could be.

§ 53. IX. The law with regard to picketing, as laid down by the judges, shows in how far the practice is legal, what can, and what can not be lawfully done by the pickets. Under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, a workman was sentenced, at the Hammersmith Police Court, to two months' imprisonment with hard labour for delivering handbills; he did not coerce, not even persuade, it did not appear in evidence that he even spoke to the complainant; all he did was to deliver a handbill, which was neither offensive nor dictatorial, but the employers prosecuted, and the man was sentenced. On appeal, the prosecution withdrew from the case, and the man escaped punishment. In other cases men were convicted simply for asking for contributions from members in arrears, and for speaking persuasively without molestation or obstruction. The last of such cases was that of the cabinet-makers, just before the repeal of the Act; this prosecution excited the sympathy of great numbers entirely outside the pale of the unions, and even of some who were opposed to them. By the Acts of 1875, the law was considerably modified, not so much in its form and language, as in the fact that previously it was special, and applied only to workmen—by its administration it was narrowed to union-workmen—whereas now it is general and applies to all classes alike. Every decision therefore has to take into consideration its bearings upon the public at large; judges have to weigh its probable effects, when applied to cases other than industrial disputes. Interference with workmen by threats, obstruction, or other coercive means, is manifestly unlawful and unjustifiable, as each man has a right for himself to make the best terms he

can for his own labour, and he should not be molested in seeking to make a bargain for the disposal of his labour. It is alike contrary to common sense and sound policy, for those who are loudest in demanding liberty for themselves to endeavour to fetter the freedom of others, in the lawful pursuit of their own ends, in their own way. It would be an intolerable piece of tyranny in those who clamour for just and equal laws, and who are so sensitive to every act on the part of the Government, or of employers, if they sought to impose conditions, by coercive means, upon those who are free agents, and who have an equal right with themselves to do, or forbear to do, that which the law and the constitution sanctions, and common sense approves.

§ 54. There is, however, such a thing as social pressure; this may sometimes be very inconvenient, even oppressive, but it is not unlawful. It is exercised in every department of life, by all classes, sects, parties, and coteries, the higher the social status the more powerfully does this influence operate on the minds of those who are privileged to come within the circle. It is found in the State, in the Church, in clubs, in political factions, and in religious bodies; but no law has ever been devised with the view of putting it down, and no sane man would ever propose such a law. It is impossible to prevent the exercise of this power of influencing people, even if it were desirable to do so. Any kind of legislative interference would be intolerable, inquisitorial, and more mischievous than the evil which it attempted to abate. When the true principles of liberty are better appreciated, and the proper legislative functions of Government are better understood, the evils complained of will cease. Coercive influences will be corrected by a higher code of morals, and a more liberal allowance will be made for individual conviction.

§ 55. The practical question is, what a workman may, and what he cannot, rightly do. No one surely will deny that a man is entitled to speak to another, if the person spoken to does not resent it as a liberty and an intrusion, in which case the speaker has no right to force either his conversation, his advice, or his company, and the person addressed has the remedy in his own hands. In some cases it is held to be unlawful to restrain

another, even if he is, or appears to be, about to do something which will result in personal injury to himself; in other cases interference is held to be justifiable. In all such matters the line to be drawn proceeds rather from a code of social morals, than from statutory enactments. The freedom of individual action is restrained in many ways other than those provided by Act of parliament, and those restraints are often beneficial, both to the parties concerned and to the body politic. The law may define by statute, and by decisions which become precedents, where the legal right begins and ends.

§ 56. In the matter of the relative rights and duties of workmen, one towards the other, the law is clear and emphatic, and the decisions by the following authorities may be pronounced reasonable and just:

(1) The Recorder of London (the late Mr. Russell Gurney), in his charge to the grand jury, in reference to the cabinet-makers' case, said:

> The employers had a perfect right to say that in future they would not employ men who were not willing to be paid by piece-work, and the men had a perfect right to say that they would not work on those terms. Not only had each man that right, but the men as a body had a right to agree together that they would not work on those terms, and they were at liberty to persuade others to come to the same determination. And this they might do in the expectation that the employers, in consequence of their inability to obtain workmen upon their terms, would be willing to waive those terms. The question is, not whether they have endeavoured to take their stand by themselves refusing to work, and by persuading others not to work; this they have a perfect right to do; but the question is whether they have tried to effect that object in a way that is forbidden by the Act, and with that purpose. That they did watch the place of business, probably, there is no doubt, but there are some purposes for which they had a perfect right to watch. When a contest of this sort is going on, it is not unusual, I believe, to watch, in order to see that none of the men who receive what is called "strike pay" are also receiving wages from the employer. But the more important object, no doubt, that the watchers had in view was, to inform all comers when, for instance, any might have been attracted to come there by the advertisements which had been inserted in the newspapers, to inform them of the existence of the strike, and

endeavour to persuade them to join them. All this is lawful so long as it is done peaceably, without anything being done to interfere with the perfect exercise of free-will on the part of those who were otherwise willing to work on the terms proposed by the employer.

The distinction to which I wish to draw your attention is well pointed out, as it appears to me, by Mr. Justice Lush, in a case in which a similar question arose, in which he says: "To bring them within the terms of the Act under which the indictment is framed, there must have been threats or molestation, otherwise than by endeavouring peaceably and in a reasonable manner to persuade others to abstain from work. The question we have to decide is, whether the defendants did endeavour to control the free agency, or overcome the free will of their fellow-workmen by force or intimidation. If there had been merely persuasion in the matter, whatever the consequences were, it would not be an unlawful act."

It seems to me, gentlemen, that, guided as one may fairly be by that decision of the learned judge, and by that exposition of the law in which I perfectly agree, I would suggest to you that the sort of question you will have to ask yourselves is, whether the evidence shows that the defendants were guilty of obstructing, and rendering difficult of access, the prosecutor's place of business, or whether anything which they did was calculated to deter or intimidate those who were passing to and fro, or whether there was an exhibition of force, calculated to produce fear in the minds of ordinary men, or whether the defendants, or any of them, combined for that purpose, and whether they combined in order to do it.

If you think that, it seems to me, then it will be your duty to find a true bill; but if you think their conduct may be accounted for by a desire to ascertain who were the persons working there, or peaceably to persuade them or any others who were proposing to work there, to join their fellow-workmen, who were contending, whether rightly or wrongly, to act for the interests of the general body, it seems to me that there is no evidence to establish the charge here made. Did they conspire together, first by the exhibition of force to obstruct the passage of persons to the place of business, and by that exhibition of force to deter them from taking a line contrary to that of the persons exhibiting that force, or whether they conspired, by terror and intimidation, to deprive the men of their free will to bestow their labour just where they thought fit. If they did that it seems to me that they have laid themselves open to a criminal charge. But if, on the contrary, they were only there peaceably to warn persons that there was a

strike, and peaceably to tell them that it would be to their interest to join their strike, and not to adopt a system which, whether rightly or wrongly, was what they considered otherwise than advantageous to their interests; if they merely did that I cannot see any ground upon which this criminal charge exists.

§ 57. (2) Mr. Baron Bramwell, at the Manchester Summer Assizes, on July 14th, 1876, in trying a case, said:

There was no harm in "picketing" if they conducted it so as not to terrify people; but that they should interfere, by violence, to prevent a man following employment in the way he thought was most for his own benefit, and in doing which he did them no wrong or injustice, was the most intolerable piece of tyranny he knew of, and must be severely punished. He wished to give them a word of friendly warning; he advised them to let their fellow-workmen be as free as they themselves would desire freedom —to make no attempt to enslave them against their liking or inclination.

§ 58. (3) Mr. Baron Huddleston, when trying the case which arose out of the engineers' strike at Erith, at the Maidstone Summer Assizes, on July 14th, 1876, said:

The law now was perfectly fair and equal as to masters and men. The Act was altered last Session in the interests of the men, and ought to be respected by them. The masters in the present case had desired to introduce piece-work, and had a perfect right to do so. The men had an equal right to refuse it; but they had no right to combine in order to exercise tyranny upon others. You have a right to arrange your own terms of working, but you have no right to combine to impose restrictions upon others. You may advocate your own views, argument, and reasoning, but you must not endeavour, by unlawful means, to compel others to abstain from working.

§ 59. The decisions above cited contain the kernel of the whole case, as regards picketing. The sentence last quoted accurately defines what may and what may not be done in the course of labour disputes. The man who attempts to go beyond this is an enemy to his own class; he injures the cause with which he is connected; he violates every right of citizenship, legal, political, social, and moral, and, if the practice of picketing

is continued, the trade unions of the country who sanction it, and use it as a weapon in their social warfare, must so control it that it shall not be exercised to the detriment of others, or in such a way as to violate the personal right of those who may, for the time being, be opposed to the action of those on strike, or who may feel disposed to accept the terms offered by the employers.

CHAPTER VIII.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE.—RESTRICTIVE RULES OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. Apart altogether from the general abuse heaped upon trade unions by public speakers and writers, many of whom know little about them, and care even less, except indeed in the sense of a desire to suppress them altogether by a process of stamping out, they have been subjected to special condemnation in many quarters in consequence of the restrictions, which it is alleged many of the unions endeavour to enforce, for the purpose of regulating the methods of employment, the quantity and quality of work, the employment of non-union men and unskilled labour, the limitation of apprentices, the regulation of the labour of women and children, the prohibition of the use of machinery, and many other matters which are important as elements in trade, and especially so in the manufacture of saleable commodities which require the labour of many hands.

§ 2. In no single book has so many of these allegations been brought together as in Mr. Thornton's work "On Labour." It is a pity that Mr. Thornton did not consult some of the "trade union leaders," at least to the same extent as he evidently did some of the employers, before he committed his otherwise excellent book to the press; if he had, he would have learnt something on the other side, which might have modified some of his strictures. Mr. Thornton tried to be just: he evidently took some pains to be accurate, but he forgot the fable of the chameleon, or he would have remembered that others have eyes as well as he. In Chapter V., Book iii., of the above work, he says: "The great unionist error consists in interfering paternally

with individual liberty in matters which chiefly concern individual interests, and in insisting in things being done which, unless done cheerfully, had better not be done at all. The error is one of a sort to which leading unionists and working class leaders generally are peculiarly prone. A favourite notion of theirs is that whatever seems to them right to be done, people ought to be made to do, and a most pestilent notion it is to be entertained by the foremost men of a class who have just been formally invested with the power of making people do whatever they please. Would that these could be persuaded to take 'Mill on Liberty' as their daily manual and bosom companion."

§ 3. It was with something of a patronising air, that Mr. Thornton expressed the wish that trade union leaders would study Mr. Mill's essay on Liberty. Many of those leaders had carefully studied Mr. Mill on "Liberty," and on many other subjects. But working class leaders were not and are not the only men needing instruction from Mr. Mill, or who would have benefited by making that particular work, and others by the same author, their daily manuals and bosom companions. Mr. Thornton himself admits this. But the leaders of working men sometimes find it as hard to get a little common sense into the heads of many trade unionists as Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright found it to be to infuse a little common sense into the obtuse heads of the sturdy British farmers, or as some men in our day find it to drive a small dose of the same commodity into the heads of aldermen of the City of London. It is no easy matter to reform abuses of any kind, whether in Church or State, or in the body called society, especially when what are called "vested interests" are at stake. The resistance to improved methods of procedure is as great in the learned professions, and even in the matter of new inventions in science and art, as it is in the ranks of the artisan and labouring classes. Every kind of reform is obstructed at first. The accusation, therefore, of unreasonable obstruction must not all be laid at the doors of working men; and least of all must it be visited on their leaders, even if they do not rush with open arms to receive every proposition which is made to them

ostensibly for their benefit, and ultimately with the object of benefiting all classes.

§ 4. It is not correct, as stated by Mr. Thornton, that the unions interfere paternally with individual liberty in matters which chiefly concern individual interests. The unions are made up of "individual interests," and it is only by common consent that these are made subservient to the common good. If the individual resents the restraints which a society must exercise over its members, he can at once cease to be a member, and take his own course; there can be no insisting on things being done unless he, as an individual, has agreed to them, and then he is only bound so long as he voluntarily continues a member.

§ 5. Again, with all due deference to Mr. Thornton, it is equally incorrect to say of "leading unionists and working-class leaders generally," that "a favourite notion of theirs is that whatever seems to them to be right to be done, people ought to be made to do," "a most pestilent notion it is," by whomsoever entertained, but it certainly is not the peculiar weakness of trade union leaders, as Mr. Thornton would have us believe, and, as he would have learnt if he had come into close contact with them, and ascertained their views. That some of them have absurd notions there can be little doubt, but so have priests and parsons, teetotalers, vegetarians, anti-tobacconists, anti-vaccinators, and politicians, of all sorts and creeds, and most of all political economists entertain them, to which class Mr. Thornton himself belongs. Prejudices and absurdities are certainly not monopolies. No one class can claim an hereditary right in them; they are common to all classes and sections of the community, and it is as impossible to eradicate them all at once as it would be to demolish Mont Blanc with a pickaxe of moonshine. Of course there is no reason why earnest efforts should not be made to get rid of prejudices and obstructions—the only question is, how? First of all, it is necessary that the man who attempts to battle with them, should be quite sure that all the facts are clearly known to him, and also the attendant modifying circumstances, if any. Next, that he should be able to state the case accurately and without prejudice. If this be not done, the

absurdity of his conclusions will only recoil on himself. Full explanations ought then to be given with regard to the effects which a particular course of action would have on all the parties concerned. Under the very best conditions the process of improvement must be slow, for custom, prejudice, interest, and similar motives, exercise a powerful influence on the minds of the wisest and best of mankind, and they are held as tenaciously by the educated as they are by the ignorant. This fact should be borne in mind by those who attack trade unions in the aggregate, because of some blunder in policy, absurdity in practice, or violence in method, which even the best informed of the leaders are powerless to prevent, or even to modify, although they may be convinced that they are evils to be eradicated.

§ 6. The allegations made against trade unions are so numerous that it is scarcely possible to embrace every one of them in this chapter, or answer in minute detail all the accusations made against them by their opponents. It is advisable, however, to examine the greater part of those given by Mr. Thornton, and reproduced by Mr. Greg, and to add some others which are so often repeated in the public press, that they are believed to be true, and consequently are accepted as veritable evidence in proof of the alleged action by trade unions being true in substance and in fact. Few societies have been so mercilessly attacked as the bricklayers. It will be well, therefore, to give some of the more prominent of the restrictions alleged to exist in the rules of their union, and which, so it is said, are strictly enforced.

§ 7. (1) It has been asserted that a rule existed in the Bricklayers' Union prohibiting a union workman from "laying bricks with both hands." This is simply absurd. No such rule exists, or ever has existed in any Bricklayers' Union. Such a rule would be too ridiculous to be inserted in the rules of any society. Not lay bricks with both hands! Why, do people imagine that a bricklayer keeps one hand in his pocket, while he lays bricks with the other, or do they suppose that every bricklayer, on being admitted to the union, consents to have one hand amputated? One-handed bricklayers—really, the thing is too preposterous to be soberly treated. It is one

of those hoaxes which, like the "sea-serpent," is periodically repeated during the dull season in the newspapers; and, as in the Oban case, in the spring of 1877, the circumstances are sometimes given with such marvellous minuteness of detail that they appear so to substantiate the statements, that finally, by credulous people, they are assumed to be correct, because of the supposed confirmatory evidence, until presently they are made aware of the fact that the whole thing is a huge and clumsy joke.

§ 8. What, then, does it all mean? Is there no foundation for it, or how did it originate? In the first place, the bricklayer, as a matter of fact, never does and never can, unless under very exceptional circumstances, lay bricks with both hands; and the oddest thing of all is, that he only lays the bricks with his left hand. Oh, the lazy rascal! some persons will exclaim. He not only refuses to lay bricks with both hands, but selects the weakest even for that purpose. Stop, my friend. His right hand is otherwise engaged. In his right hand he holds the trowel, with which he spreads the mortar, and strikes the joints; in his right hand is the skill, in the left the labour—the one is engaged from morning to night in picking up bricks one by one from the scaffold, and laying them in their places; the other, with the aid of the trowel, assists in adjusting them to the line, levelling them, and striking the joint. Both hands are fully employed, as any one can see if he will but watch a bricklayer for half an hour. But why does he not put down his trowel, and lay his bricks with both hands? some one else will ask. Stay a moment. If he did, he would not, as a rule, be able to do as much work in the day, and what he did would not be done well. The thing is so utterly foolish that the wonder is that sensible people were ever taken in by the stupid hoax. It would be as reasonable for a merchant to insist upon his clerks writing with both their hands, as for the bricklayer to lay bricks with both hands. These silly notions were for the most part the inventions of persons knowing nothing about the trade or its requirements; they are not the accusations of intelligent employers. The only germ of truth in the charge is, that in very wide walls, and sometimes in footings and foundations, the trowel

may be, for a moment, put down, and the bricks taken up with both hands, for what is called "filling in." No rule has ever been laid down by any union forbidding this, nor is the practice resented, if it can be done with advantage. But even in such cases the advantage is not great; if the right hand is subjected to the wear and tear of the hard gritty brick, the fingers become chapped to such an extent that the worker can scarcely hold his trowel, and hence he loses in skill and dexterity, which, in the long run, lessens the quantity and at the same time interferes with the quality of the work. Of all the lame imputations against trade unionists, the most impotent, preposterous, and ignorant, was the one about one-handed bricklayers, which was reproduced in every possible shape, for the purpose of denouncing the supposed folly of trade unionists.

§ 9. (2) Another rule alleged to exist is that one man shall not be allowed to lay more bricks than another, that the number of bricks which a bricklayer may set is defined, and that no man shall exceed this fixed limit. No such rule ever existed. The number of bricks which a man can lay altogether depends upon the nature of the work, and the circumstances attending it. At some kinds of work a man could well lay a thousand bricks in one day, perhaps even more; in other cases he will have to work very hard in order to lay 300 properly. For work requiring skill, the master or foreman will select the best man, the less skilful being placed where the work is more laborious; the one gives quantity, the other supplies quality. On "face-work," that is, on the outside of the building, quality is required, which demands extra time; on the inside of the wall the workman has to make up in quantity for his lack of skill, because the work is rougher, and is generally covered by the plasterer. It is well known to every practical man that the number of bricks laid varies with the kind of work to be performed; and even on face-work, a very small and apparently trivial thing will add to the difficulty, and proportionately lessen the number of bricks a man can lay. For instance, if one man has a small angle or projection, he has to keep it "plumb"; this will necessitate extra care, and consequently lessen the number of bricks he will be able to lay.

§ 10. (3) Chasing, as it is termed, was the invention of "jerry-builders" and "field-rangers." At one time they were in the habit of giving a man 6*d.* per day extra to "run" the others; it was a kind of nigger-driving, little suited to free and independent workmen. If the one man deserved 6*d.* per day for chasing, another, who had to do as much as he, and did it as well, also deserved the extra 6*d.*; if this was refused, there was a just cause of complaint. But the system has been given up, and therefore deserves little notice. Although no rules existed with reference to the practice, it was universally condemned by the men, and whenever it was possible they resisted it. Such a system was never resorted to by respectable employers; it was confined chiefly to "jerry-builders" and "sloggers," and even with them the practice is discontinued. A good and efficient foreman always knows how much work ought to be done, and he will see that the proper quantity is executed one way or the other. By selecting men best fitted for particular tasks, and by placing each in the proper place, and also by exercising foresight in securing a proper supply of materials, he will accelerate the work and prevent loss of time.

§ 11. (4) Another accusation against bricklayers is that they once entered into an alliance, offensive and defensive, with the brickmakers, whereby it was agreed that no bricklayer should be allowed to set machine-made bricks; and that no bricks were to be used in Manchester which were made beyond an arbitrarily fixed boundary line, averaging about four miles from the Exchange. If Mr. Thornton had exercised ordinary discretion, he would have learned that there was very little substantial truth in either of the above statements. In the early part of June, 1871, Mr. Edward Johnson, then a Manchester master builder, was publicly challenged to produce the rules which he alleged existed in reference to these matters, but he could not do so, and was unable to substantiate his statements. Now Mr. Johnson had agreed to the rules and regulations which were then in force; he had himself signed them, and yet he was incapable of proving the existence of the alleged arbitrary rules. With regard to machine-made bricks, most of the bricks used in Manchester were then, and had been for many years previously,

machine-made. In this respect Manchester was far ahead of all other towns, and no rule existed which in any way interfered with their manufacture, or their use by the members of the Bricklayers' Union. It is true that the brickmakers, many years ago, opposed making bricks by machinery; it was a short-sighted policy, and the only excuse that can be offered is that the men were very ignorant, and very poor, and they opposed what they thought would deprive them of the means of getting food. Others have been guilty of similar follies, without a particle of the same excuse. The opposition of the brickmakers to the use of machinery was never regarded as a very serious affair; this is proved by the fact that the largest and wealthiest of all our trade unions gave pecuniary assistance to the brick-makers when they were "in trouble" and in need; this help was given by the machine-makers, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. So uneducated were these poor brickmakers, that in London they had to hire the services of a shoemaker, to act as their secretary during many years.

§ 12. It is also true that during a certain strike many years ago an alliance was entered into between the bricklayers and brickmakers, whereby the latter agreed not to make bricks for the builders then engaged in a contest with their workmen; in return for this help the bricklayers refused to use bricks made under conditions repugnant to the brickmakers. This was a temporary alliance, during a period of social war; it was continued longer than it would otherwise have been on account of the action taken by the masters to punish the brickmakers, after the bricklayers' strike had closed. This caused the partial continuance, for a short time, of the temporary agreement. Such an agreement can only be defended on the same grounds that we defend some kingly, political, or diplomatic alliances, which are thought to be expedient under exceptional circumstances. It would, indeed, be well if every courtly alliance could be defended on equally substantial grounds. After all, the alliance needs no defence; it has been a dead letter for more than a quarter of a century, and there is little use in raking up the absurdities of the past, either in regard to trade unions or political parties; we have more than enough to do with present

stupidities. It is sufficient for our purpose to know that these follies of a bygone time are fast dying out, and that other and better rules and regulations are taking their place in the trade unions of the United Kingdom.

§ 13. (5) The rule above all others which gave umbrage to Manchester employers was the 18th bye-law for the Manchester district, as follows: "That all jobs within fifteen miles of Manchester, where the master may wish to employ bricklayers living in the neighbourhood, he may do so, by employing one Manchester man to one countryman; if an odd man is required, he must be a Manchester man; but if the job be more than fifteen miles distant, the master may employ either, provided they are members of the Operative Bricklayers' Society." The object of this rule was to prevent the influx of cheaper labour, which ultimately would have had the effect of lowering the wages in Manchester, by bringing into the town men from underpaid districts where the union was not so powerful and compact. This rule was mutually agreed upon by the masters and the men, by a contract entered into and signed by both parties. The intention of the rule was undoubtedly protective, in so far as the workmen were concerned; it was intended to prevent constant bickerings with regard to wages, arising from the employment of unskilled—or at least underskilled—workmen, who, as is well known, in small towns and country places are generally less skilled than those living in large towns. Lord Brassey has proved beyond a doubt that highly paid labour is less costly in the end than cheap labour, and hence the disadvantages, whatever they may have been, of this protective rule, were not so much against the masters as is usually supposed. Still, the rule cannot be defended on economic grounds; the only real defence is that it was a mutual arrangement between employers and employed in Manchester, and, being a contract, the terms were binding on both sides.

§ 14. (6) It is further stated that the society's rules provide that all foremen bricklayers shall be members of the union. This is not correct. In Manchester they endeavoured to retain foremen as members of the union, so far as they are able to do so; but in the London Union they are in effect excluded. A

positive prohibition is detrimental alike to masters and journeymen. The more exclusive the union, the more likely is it to adopt measures which, in their general results, will be disadvantageous to those without the pale of such union. If employers, foremen, and workmen belonged to the same society, the conclusions arrived at, and the measures concerted, would often be more acceptable than they now are. The interests of capital and labour are not so diametrically opposed as some imagine; but capitalists and labourers are often at variance, and in antagonism, mainly the result of crude economical doctrines.

§ 15. (7) Another complaint is that bricklayers stipulate that every bricklayer shall have one labourer to attend on him, whether there be work for him to do or not. There is no such rule. It is usual for the bricklayer to have a labourer, and no master in his senses would permit the bricklayer at 9*d.* or 10*d.* an hour to do labourers' work, which can be done for 6*d.* or 7*d.* per hour. This is a matter which regulates itself, without unionist influences. If several bricklayers are working together, and a less number of labourers can do the necessary work to keep them going, there is no rule or custom to prevent it. It is the employer's duty to see to this, in his own interest; if he has less or more than a sufficient number to supply the materials required, he will be the sufferer. There may have been occasions when a mechanic has refused to "lend a helping hand," even in cases of emergency. This may not be very commendable; it is possibly deserving of censure, but it does not wear the ugly aspect usually ascribed to it by opponents of trade unions. It is very doubtful whether a clerk in a mercantile firm would consent to do the work of an ordinary packer or warehouseman; he would most likely refuse, and even resent, what he would term the degradation. All "labour is honourable," but every one knows that all classes of work are not equally agreeable or welcome. It is so in every grade of life, not less or more with craftsmen than with others.

§ 16. (8) With regard to alleged restrictions concerning the division of labour, such as what may be done by the bricklayer, mason, or plasterer respectively, and what shall or shall not be done by the labourer, the dispute is not caused by the rules of the union, but by the nature of the work, except in so

far as the rules prohibit unskilled labour doing that which they consider ought to be paid for at the higher wages of the artisan, and not at labourers' prices. This continual craving for the increased employment of unskilled labour is altogether at variance with the cry for extended technical instruction, the purpose of which is to increase the skill of the workmen; the practice in the one case, does not accord with the theory of the other. In every town there is a class of men called handy-labourers, who undertake to do almost every kind of work, in a rough and ready kind of way, and they are useful enough in their sphere, especially in what are called jobbing shops; but if one of these men went to a builder's yard and asked for employment, and offered to do every kind of work—masons', bricklayers', plasterers', to say nothing of carpenters' or plumbers', the master would shrug his shoulders, and say, "No, I have no vacancies; I am full-handed." Such men are called "Jack of all trades, master of none;" they are useful in a new country, in the backwoods, and in small jobbing masters' yards, where they are seldom interfered with, but they are not in demand where good and capable men are required.

§ 17. (9) Then it is said a carpenter must not chisel away a bit of brickwork when fixing a frame, a joist, or any similar kind of work. In reply it should be stated that every outdoor carpenter carries his own chisel, on purpose to do such kind of work when needed. Cases have been reported where some interference has taken place, but as related it is impossible for them to be true; they are either greatly exaggerated, or there were circumstances behind altogether unexplained, which, if known, would put a different complexion on the whole matter. It cannot be denied that there is a prejudice against one man interfering with another man's work; the same prejudice exists in every grade of society; it is popularly expressed in the old adage, "Let the cobbler stick to his last;" in all such cases reason and common sense must be exercised, lest the interference be resented as unjustifiable, impolitic, and absurd. Nothing can be more injurious to workmen than a peddling, meddling, and fussy policy; it not only irritates employers, but it annoys other workmen, and brings down on the union the indignation of the

public, who, in the long run, have to pay. The instances of such interference are generally exaggerated, but union workmen will do well to avoid giving cause for injurious accusations, by abstaining from a policy of intermeddling unless there are solid grounds for so doing.

§ 18. (10) Walking time is not general in the building trades; in some parts of Lancashire, it was formerly granted by special agreement between the operatives and the employers. Building operatives are subject to constant changes as to locality of work and distance from home; a man is seldom sure where he will be sent; one day he might be within a mile of his home, another day he will be four or five miles distant. In some shops, it was at one time usual for a workman to be at the yard or office at 6 a.m. to report himself, and walk thence to the job; this loss of time was wholly at the expense of the employer and the public; a change was afterwards made, the men being expected to be at the job, ready to commence work, at six o'clock. But the distance to be walked varied greatly; sometimes it took only about a quarter of an hour, at other times over an hour. An arrangement was then entered into whereby the men were required to be at a certain place at six o'clock; this "station" was by mutual consent fixed at certain central points; the men then walked the remainder of the way in the master's time. Even in this case they were expected to be at their work at a given time, the distance being accurately gauged. By this means distance was to some extent equalised; the result of this arrangement was that the time seldom exceeded half an hour's walk in the men's own time, and about the same at the expense of the master. This agreement or contract had reference only to the morning; it did not apply to travelling home at night, so that, after all, the question was not a very serious one. It was narrowed in its effect, and confined to a few localities, and therefore it certainly did not merit the severe condemnation which was levelled against it. With regard to the allegation that men linger on the road, when going from one job to another, it may or may not be true in some instances; but surely it is not true universally, or even generally. If a workman only walks at the rate of three miles

an hour, and has to carry a load of tools, most persons would consider it a reasonable pace, although not a killing one; in any case it was not the snail's pace as represented. This, again, is too trivial a matter for lengthened discussion, especially as the custom has died out.

§ 19. (11) The masons in some cases laid themselves open to severe animadversion by reason of certain rules and regulations, but these have undergone considerable modification during the last few years. The local rules which prohibited the working of stone at the quarry could not be justified; they were restrictive in the sense of interfering with an employer's right to obtain his materials from the best market, and to get them worked up where to him seemed best. The shoemakers or tailors could with as much show of reason say to an employer: You shall not have your boots or coats made at the East End to sell in the West End; they shall be made in the locality where they are offered for sale. Dictation of this kind is the result of a short-sighted policy, the effects of which recoil on those who attempt to enforce it. Some of the rules said to exist in the Masons' Union were the fanciful creations of opponents; they had no foundation whatever in fact. This is not the way to reform abuses. It resembles a game of skittles, where men stick up a number of blocks of wood for the pleasure of knocking them down again; the sport may be good enough for those who like it, but it serves no useful purpose. So it is with the rules of trade unions. If some really deserve condemnation, single them out, state them fairly, criticise them severely, and plead for their abrogation; but do not create side issues by attacking those which do not exist. If this plan had been pursued, the restrictions still existing would long since have been abandoned as untenable, instead of which, the men lose sight of the real cause of complaint, in endeavours to rebut those that are false. It must be remembered that the objectionable rules were confined to certain districts in the north of England, and were not imposed or enforced by the central committee; often they opposed them, and refused support in case of a strike. A case occurred at Darlington where two delegates from the executive were sent to effect a settlement of the dispute; these condemned

the action of the local men, pointed out the absurd position in which they had placed themselves, and urged the men to return to work. In accordance with this advice, a resolution was passed withdrawing the demand, and the men recommenced work the following day. Numerous instances of this kind occur, quite unknown to the general public, in which the committee of the union have restrained hasty and ill-advised action on the part of the men.

§ 20. The labourers come in for a fair share of misrepresentation. Mr. Thornton says that in "Liverpool a bricklayer's labourer may legally carry as many as twelve bricks at a time, elsewhere ten is the greatest number allowed." Mr. Thornton may be surprised to learn that fourteen or even sixteen bricks is much nearer the mark than ten.* As to the rule said to exist in Leeds, and quoted, to the effect that no labourer shall carry more than eight bricks, the thing seems absurd on the face of it; but if Mr. Thornton has seen the rule which he professes to quote, of course it must be true; at the same time, the regulation appears to be too stupid to have any real existence. It is further said that at Birmingham there is an agreement that the number of bricks to be carried shall vary with the height to which they have to be carried, which is not at all unreasonable, when one considers that a hodful of bricks is equal to over a hundredweight. But even if some of the things were true as alleged against the labourers, it would not militate against trade unions. Mr. Thornton, however, shows that he had been imposed on by quoting the following Irish joke, in confirmation of his strictures. "One day an Irish labourer was caught by his master carrying only eight bricks to the first floor, yet insisted that he was in order. 'Why,' cries the master, 'it is only the first floor.' 'Ah! sure,' retorts Pat, 'but then 'tis a three-storey ladder.'"

§ 21. Another story was to the effect that labourers may not go up one ladder and down another. In all seriousness, can this be true? If it is, how is it that such rules were altogether unknown to those engaged in the building trades, to

* This allegation must have been a hoax, as the bricks used in Liverpool were larger and heavier than those in use elsewhere.

whom they were as much a surprise, as they were welcome to those who condemn trade unions? With regard to opposition to the use of wheelbarrows, there may have been some foolish restrictions here and there, but frequently the opposition was well grounded, on account of the difficulties and dangers which formerly attended such a practice.* Whenever a case of this kind occurs, it is well to know the precise reason, inasmuch as sweeping condemnation, in general terms, is hardly ever just; every case must stand or fall by its own merits or demerits, whatever these may be.

§ 22. One of the many accusations against trade unions is their opposition to an influx of unskilled labour into skilled trades. The grounds of this opposition are that they tend to overstock the trade, and consequently lower the wages of higher skilled workmen. This is undoubtedly true; moreover, the handicraftsman has to give the fruits of his skill, obtained by long experience, and often great cost, to another, without recompense, fee, or reward, and at the risk of his own displacement. Of course the labourer has a right to live as well as the artisan; the industrial problem is how to improve the former without debasing the latter. The methods proposed by some would have the effect of levelling down the entire class, to a lower standard, instead of elevating those who are now in a condition of wretchedness, by reason of their lack of knowledge, and of trained skill. Reducing the wages of skilled workmen is not the best way of ameliorating the condition of the people; a more excellent way would be to advance the wages of those who are now underpaid, for high wages are a benefit to the working classes, the opinions often expressed to the contrary notwithstanding. How, then, are we to deal with the vast mass of unskilled labour? A very proper question, and one which the social reformer must endeavour to answer. In the first place, the spread of education will assist in promoting the welfare of all, inasmuch as it will fit them for work of a higher order, will develop both their knowledge and taste, and open up to them new sources of employment. In the second place,

* Lifts are now in use, by which danger is avoided, and the supply of materials is accelerated to any height.

mechanical improvements will produce a further division of labour, thereby affording a greater chance to the poorer classes for obtaining employment in industries which are now partially closed to them. An improved method of apprenticeship, without prohibition or restriction, will assist in lessening the number of those now termed unskilled, and thereby add a new force to the ranks of those classed as artisans.

§ 23. The antagonism to non-union workmen is not quite so defensible, seeing that association is based on the voluntary principle; but the men naturally say: We have a right either to work with, or refuse to work with, whomsoever we please. This much must be conceded; but if they go beyond this, and interfere with the personal liberty of another, they have no legal or moral right to do so. In order to remedy this, employers have often proposed to establish a society of non-union workmen. This is a paradox; such attempts have been frequently made, but have failed, as they must do, in the very nature of things. A society of non-union men would be guilty of coercion similar to that of which they, or their employers, complain; they would probably strike against union workmen, which would but aggravate the evils, not cure them. The refusal to work with a non-unionist is one of the rocks trade unions have to avoid; the practice cannot be defended either on social or political grounds, and the sooner it is altogether abandoned the better. It is a strange fact, but true nevertheless, that some of those who prate the loudest about political freedom are the stoutest defenders of this anachronism. The common sense of the majority of intelligent unionists will consign a policy of this kind to the limbo of the past, as it has done the opposition to machinery, and many other matters.

§ 24. The alleged opposition of trade unions to the employment of women and children has been much misunderstood. As a matter of fact their action has been fully endorsed by the nation, by the enactment of just laws for the protection of women, young persons, and children, consequently not one word need be said in justification of their conduct. The Factory Acts and the Elementary Education Acts afford the best evidence as to their policy in regard to the employment of

young children; and to their credit be it said they were almost unanimous in their support of those measures. Generally speaking they have been in favour of all legislation for the protection of women, although their motives are often challenged. It is said by some that the chief reason for desiring protective legislation for women, was the ultimate benefit of the men. It is always difficult to define motives, and in this case the difficulty is increased by reason of the opposite opinions entertained by those who promoted the legislation. Even were it so, the result has justified the course pursued, and has benefited those on whose behalf it was taken. In recent years a class of economists has arisen who call in question the beneficence of these Acts and denounce any extension of them. They proclaim liberty for women, but in reality it means liberty for employers —first, to pit one woman against another, and secondly, to put them in antagonism to the men. Women are essentially weak, in an industrial as well as a physical sense, as those know who are acquainted with the facts of actual life. Some of the causes of this weakness lie deep and hidden in human nature, others are not far to seek. The fact, however, is patent; woman needs protection. The better nature of men in the aggregate acknowledges this, even when it is denied or refused individually. The laws enacted for their benefit are the result of a consciousness of their weakness, and of their need of protection. To retreat now would have the effect of undoing all the good previous legislation has secured to them, and of rendering them more than ever helpless in their struggle for existence. Sometimes men have been guilty of trying to exclude women from employments suited to their character and nature; but this has been done by others as well as artisans. The struggle for the freedom of women is not yet over; but those who suspect trade unionists of being their greatest enemies, are mistaken in every sense of the word. Avenues to the employment of women ought to be open more than they are, but the less they compete with men, in the commercial sense of competition, the better for both.

§ 25. These are some of the restrictions, alleged by the opponents of trade unions, to exist in their rules, bye-laws, and regulations, and which they are said to exercise to the detriment

of the community. A careful examination of all the circumstances and facts, will show that many of them are misunderstood, that some of them are exaggerated, and that others are not so vicious as they have been represented. A truer appreciation of the conditions of industrial life, and a healthier tone of public feeling will have the effect of modifying some, and of abolishing others; those only will remain which are justified by experience, and consecrated by their beneficial results. The false will give place to the true; mere expedients, for temporary purposes, will yield to principles based on experience; the power of knowledge will supplant the force of ignorance and of habit, and the nation will be benefited in proportion as each individual in the State is educated, improved, and refined.

§ 26. Some of the instances of alleged restrictions, given by Mr. Thornton, are so ridiculously absurd that it would be sheer waste of time to reply to them. Certainly some of them are capital jokes; others must be pure inventions, not by Mr. Thornton, but by those who supplied him with the information, or they may have been fabricated by some ingenious penny-a-liner, to be seriously retailed by those estimable people who are ever on the alert to lecture working men on their follies or misconduct, but who fail to accomplish any real good, or effect any useful purpose, because they are totally unacquainted with the subject with which they deal, or so inadequately informed that they end in making confusion worse confounded. It is very lamentable to find good men, who ought to know better, repeating calumnies which have been denied over and over again, quite unconscious, as it would seem, of the fact that they have been absolutely repudiated by those against whom they are uttered. A sad instance of this occurred some years ago in a publication called *The Fountain*, said to be a religious paper, edited by the Rev. Dr. Parker, in which appeared a scurrilous article, by an anonymous slanderer, who, taking for granted all the allegations against unionist workmen, reviled them in language hardly decent even for Dr. Kenealy's once popular *Englishman*. By implication, nay, actually in express terms, trade unionists were denounced as ruffians and murderers. What would the editor think of a man who was wicked enough

to stigmatise the whole body of Nonconformist ministers, because a few cases have come to light in which such men have disgraced themselves and their cloth, by drunkenness, debauchery, or crime? Lest it should be thought that the article alluded to is misrepresented, or too harshly condemned, a few choice sentences may be quoted in corroboration of the description above given: (*a*) "I distinctly hold that if trades unionism be not freed from some elements which now belong to it, we shall find ourselves groaning under a most humiliating and insupportable tyranny." (*b*) "There are working men in England this day—able men, honest, industrious, and in every respect truly worthy—who are as much in bondage as ever were the black slaves in Southern America." (*c*) "The cry of these men was, Let ships come from every land with corn, and reduce the high prices demanded by English farmers; but now the cry is, Let ships come from every land and bring men who will relieve and stimulate the labour market in England. The very men who favoured the abolition of the Corn Laws would murder the men who would abolish the monopoly of labour." (*d*) "Some employers are indeed to be pitied. In some cases they are wholly at the mercy of gangs of ignorant, drunken, brutal ruffians, who care no more for England than they care for an Indian jungle."* There are other expressions in this article equally sad, and morally disgraceful, especially when written by a man with the words of the Gospel of Jesus Christ on his lips, which, above all things, is based upon, and should be imbued with, the charity which suffereth long and is kind. The only excuse for the writer is that he knew nothing of the men whom he so traduced—men who have done more to better the condition of working people than all the charities in England, and all the sermons delivered during the present century. Neither of these agencies are in any sense here condemned, much less despised. If the religion of Christ were only preached in its purity, and practised as He taught it, these things could not be,

* The extracts here given are retained as a sample of the kind of attacks which were general in the press, on the platform, in parliament, and even in the pulpit, before their exposure in the first edition of this work.

and the working classes might be more willing than they now appear to be, to bow down before that Cross named by the writer aforesaid at the conclusion of his article.

§ 27. It may be asked: Are we to infer that the whole of the tales told about trade union restrictions and doings are mere fabrications, or *canards* invented for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the public, or with the object of so debasing trade unions in public estimation, in order that they should be accounted nuisances to be removed, or evils to be stamped out? By no means. There were restrictions which deserved to be exposed; these were as disastrous to the unions as to the employers. Moreover, when the objects sought are not blameworthy, sometimes the means adopted are not commendable. We are a slow people; it is not easy to throw off old prejudices, or obsolete methods, and adapt ourselves to new circumstances and improved conditions, in regard to other matters as well as labour.

§ 28. Evidence of the existence of restrictions are from time to time afforded when a new kind of manufacture is produced, the effect of which alters the old methods of working. Some such were manifested when iron ships first began to take the place of "the wooden walls of old England." Similarly on the introduction of terra-cotta, in building construction; disputes have arisen as to who should do the riveting of the one case, or the setting in the other. Trade unions have need to exercise care and caution in these matters. Interference of this kind affects workmen as well as employers, and endangers the well-being of both. So long as the price paid is fair, the man best able to do the work should be allowed to do it without molestation, let, or hindrance. Improved methods, new appliances, new machinery, new products, all must be utilised and welcomed, as sources of additional wealth. Every barrier placed in the way of their adoption will but end in disaster, to the detriment of all classes. Every effort to retard progress will assuredly fail, and the evil consequences arising from a short-sighted policy, or bigoted opposition, will fall the heaviest on the worker. Fresh discoveries in science and art must of necessity add to the wealth-producing power of the country, and give additional employment

to the great mass of the people. The capitalist, and the public, in the sense of the consumer, will be benefited by each new invention; but the greatest gainer of all, in the long run, will be the workman. At the outset men are often displaced, they have to seek employment elsewhere. In effect it resembles a surgical operation; a limb is amputated to save life; pain is inflicted, but health is restored. So with the body politic, the individual sometimes suffers, but the mass improves. As anæsthetics are administered to deaden the sense of pain, so some method of relief is required to soften the effect of suffering often caused by the use of labour-saving appliances and of machinery on its first introduction. How this can be best accomplished, cannot now be discussed.

CHAPTER IX.

I. STRIKES—THEIR OBJECTS, COST, AND RESULTS. II. FOREIGN COMPETITION.

I. STRIKES—THEIR OBJECTS, COST, AND RESULTS.

§ 1. So much has been said, either directly or incidentally, in other parts of this work, touching the question of strikes, that it is needless in this chapter to do more than refer briefly to some points which have been inadequately discussed elsewhere, and to give a bird's-eye view of the whole matter in its several aspects and bearings, by adding such further observations as may seem to be necessary in order that every phase of the labour question may be seen and understood. If we were called upon to pronounce an opinion with regard to strikes, with no other evidence before us than their frequency, it would appear that they were an absolute necessity of the times in which we live. They certainly appear to be an essential part of the economy of capital and labour, and the natural and inevitable outcome of the relationship now subsisting between employers and employed. Neither reasoning nor denunciation has been sufficiently effective to get rid of this state of chronic industrial warfare; the utmost that has been done has only diminished the friction, and rendered the collision of the opposing forces less destructive to themselves, and ruinous to the public.

§ 2. It is easy enough to define the object of strikes, but it is far from easy to estimate their cost, or trace with any degree of accuracy the results which follow in their train. The issues raised by any particular strike are usually clear and distinct. There are, however, behind these, and emanating from them,

others which are not at all times apparent, but which arise as naturally from the first cause, as the falling of the apple does from gravitation. It is this "unknown quantity" which makes some of the labour struggles so obstinate, costly, and prolonged. Shrewd men on both sides can see the tendency of this or that course of action, and the effect which must follow a concession or victory, and consequently they contend, resist, or concede, as the case may be. In general terms, the objects of strikes may be stated as follows:

I. Wages: to secure an advance or resist a reduction, whether by the day or piece.

II. Hours of labour: to effect a reduction, or oppose an extension of the working hours.

III. To limit apprentices, and hinder the employment of unskilled and non-unionist workmen.

IV. To regulate the methods of working, such as piece-work, overtime, etc.

§ 3. Morally considered, the rights or wrongs of a strike depend very much upon circumstances, and upon the means employed to compass the ends sought. Economically they are justifiable or the reverse, according to the conditions of the "labour market." Practically the whole question is reduced to a simple matter of expediency or prudence, as to time, place, and demands; and to the possibility or probability of success or failure, in the particular instance where a strike is attempted or contemplated. The object in itself might be right, and the means employed may be unobjectionable, but neither, nor both combined, would at all times justify resorting to a strike. There are many things which may be theoretically right, but which in practice are unattainable. The question of right is therefore relative, and must be circumscribed accordingly. Apart altogether from conciliation and arbitration, there are other and very important matters to be considered before a strike is resorted to; these comprehend the resources at the command of the union; the unanimity of the workmen; the state of trade, not only in the district, but in the country generally, in so far as it affects that special industry; the proportion of society to non-society men, and the possibility of the latter, under pressure or from necessity,

taking the places of those on strike. In the better-organised societies, all these things are carefully weighed beforehand; and even then they sometimes fail in their attempts; but the worst failures and greatest misery attend those where these precautions are neglected; and, what is still worse, in these very trades strikes are more frequent than they are in those where the workmen are in a better position to cope with them.

§ 4. The cost of strikes has exercised the arithmetical ingenuity of many economists, and others, who imagine that they can terrify the workmen by an array of figures which, on the surface, seems to tell against them. The unionists, on the other hand, appear as though they sometimes made a boast of their immense expenditure, for they will quote the figures prepared by their opponents in proof of their strength, and of the inexhaustible resources of the union. It might be said of figures, what is said of hard words, they break no bones; they produce very little effect upon the parties engaged in the contest, until they come home to their own doors in the shape of a stoppage of supplies. They will then begin to reason, by the aid of the new light that has dawned upon them, or to rail at the course which events have taken. It may at once be conceded that the cost of a prolonged strike is enormous, and that the distress which it occasions is ofttimes appalling; but workmen would not undergo all this suffering, and contribute their hard earnings week after week, in support of those engaged in the struggle, if there were no corresponding advantages to be gained from the outlay. It would be tedious to attempt to tabulate the estimated cost of strikes during the present century; and it would serve no useful purpose, unless we were able, at the same time, to estimate the commercial value of every successful one, and strike a balance of profit and loss. This could not possibly be done, even if the calculations employed were as profound and difficult as those used in astronomy, for there is no rule in mathematics, or standard of computation, in any of the known tables, by which to arrive at any definite result or satisfactory conclusion. There is, in fact, absolutely no comparison between the cost in pounds sterling, and the gain, material and moral, which has accrued to the working classes from some of those

labour struggles, comprehended in the term "strikes." The whole question resolves itself into one of sociological statics and dynamics. The full value of this or that force or movement must be estimated, if at all, by results which are not seen, and therefore cannot be calculated, and not merely by those only partially seen, even by the closest observers.

Estimates went the round of the press to the effect that during the lock-out on the Clyde, £150,000 were spent by the unions in support of the men out of employment, and that £312,000 were lost in wages. Again it was stated that the Manchester strike cost the unions some £80,000 and the employers £300,000; whether these estimates were true or false, the actual results of the outlay were the only true test of value. It is, however, certain that if the Manchester employers could afford to spend £300,000 to resist the demands of the men, they could not, with any show of reason, argue that they were unable to pay the extra rates claimed by the workmen. During the builders' strike and lock-out in London in 1859–60–61, many similar calculations were hazarded. Some of them were probably not far wide of the mark, in so far as the money actually spent was concerned, and also the possible loss in wages and profits, to those engaged in that obstinate and prolonged contest. But who can estimate the value of the increased pay since that time, or of the boon of the Saturday half-holiday, which resulted from that strike and lock-out? Some of the struggles of the agricultural labourers were attended with great expense, and much suffering, but the results compensated them for every penny of the outlay, and repaid them for all the trouble and temporary privation. This is the justification for every strike in the minds of those who take part in them. The fallacy which lies at the root of all those laborious financial computations is, that it is possible to make a debtor and creditor account with regard to any particular strike, in so far as it affects individual men, and it would not be difficult to show that, in many cases, these suffer an almost irrecoverable loss. The lost time is gone for ever; his domestic comforts have been interrupted; the home itself perhaps is broken up; long associations are severed; and suffering has been

endured by the man and his family. All this is true. Yet these men bear the privation cheerfully; and, what is more singular still, the most determined, and those who are prepared to endure the most, are the married men, and those with families. Why is this? No commercial reason will explain it; ledger entries cannot account for it; men who combine merely to injure do not understand it. How can they, when they strive to undersell each other, and resort to all kinds of tricks for the purpose of getting one another's customers? Sometimes two "tradesmen," who have been vigorously competing, will suddenly combine to prevent a third from opening a shop in opposition to them, or will try to "sell him up." The press and the public are ready enough to condemn the men on strike, and express pity for the "poor wives and children;" and they often need not only pity but relief. There is, however, another phase in connection with strikes, which will help to throw a light on what has been before stated—it is, that the women are often as unbending as their husbands, and as cheerfully share the poverty and misery entailed upon them, if they are persuaded that the men are in the right. Many a wavering man has been strengthened in his resolution to "stand out," by the sympathy of his wife. She will work, rather than he shall desert his colours and give way. The writer is not drawing on his imagination for these statements; they are veritable facts, attested by the experience of thousands of men, who have gone through the terrible ordeal of a long strike or lock-out. In the agricultural villages, women are the strongest supporters of the labourers' unions. In estimating the cost of strikes, the outlay in pounds sterling is the least item to be considered. The social and moral effects are of far higher moment; and no man, or body of men, can be justified in promoting or advocating a strike unless all the consequences have been carefully weighed. For this reason the social and political philosopher can speak with greater authority on these questions than the political economist, and, moreover, in proportion as they direct attention to the causes of the strikes, so will they be able to do something towards averting them.

§ 5. What, then, are the causes of industrial warfare, and

what are the principles or motives which animate the men, and sustain them in their struggles? The answer is, first, that the working classes have had to fight for every advantage which they have gained, and for every privilege which they have won; and secondly, that the results which have eventuated from the operations of trade unions, the benefits they confer, and the net gains realised through them for their members, have justified their existence, and sanctified the means legitimately employed in securing their several objects. Why do men insure their ships, their houses, their furniture, or their lives? The simple and truthful answer is, because it pays them to do so, as, if an accident should occur, it would help to cover their losses; and if they escaped such a calamity, so much the better for the insurer. The trade union is a mutual assurance society; in the long run, it pays for the investment. It is, however, that and something more. It has been said that there is no friendship in politics. There is too much reason for believing that there is a great deal of truth in the statement—more's the pity, for it is not altogether creditable, either to politics or politicians. It is even more true that there is no patriotism in trade. How can there be, considering the principles upon which it is usually conducted? But among trade unionists there is a remnant of the old spirit of patriotism still left—rude, it may be; they co-operate, support each other, and suffer, if need be, in the same cause. Clannish they are; national they will be; cosmopolitan they will aspire to be, under the tuition they have received, and are daily receiving, from employers, the press, and the public.

§ 6. Economists ask: Does the end justify the means? Are the gains equivalent to the expenditure? Are the results commensurate to the time, trouble, anxiety, and suffering endured? Neither a mathematical nor economical answer can be vouchsafed in reply to those interrogatories, which will satisfy the opponents of trade unions; the only answer that can be given is that the general results of strikes have been beneficial to the mass of the workmen. Consequently, the action of the unions is sustained, because the workmen's opinion is, formed after long experience, that by no other means are they able to accomplish the same ends. Hence they are content to find the money,

wherewithal to pay the costs; they usually supply the whole of the funds, it being seldom that they ask for support outside the pale of trade unions. It is scarcely possible to conceive that a million of hard-headed men would make such strenuous exertions, and personal sacrifices, unless they had ample proof that they would be ultimately recompensed for their self-devotion, their earnest work, and the risk which they run in the undertaking.

§ 7. It is said that the rates of wages would have been equal to what they now are, despite the unions; that combinations cannot permanently raise wages; and a number of other things equally paradoxical. If these statements were true, why howl at the action of the unions, and denounce their leaders? What can be their crime? Simply a little egotism, a foolish belief that they have made the water run up the hill, when in reality it has been struggling all along to find its own level? If all the advantages of higher wages and shorter hours of labour could be obtained, and maintained, without the aid of trade unions, we should soon cease to hear of their existence. Many of those who now denounce them, seek to substitute legislative enactment, for associative effort, which after all is political combination, instead of industrial co-operative action. Unionism is the foundation of both methods of procedure.

§ 8. How was it that the law of supply and demand was ineffectual in raising the wages of the agricultural labourers for so many years? It is well known that their rates of wages were stationary until the union stepped in to assist them. In the building trades successive advances have been made since 1847 from 5*s.* per day of ten hours, to 5*s.* 6*d.*, then to 6*s.*, and now to 7*s.* 1½*d.* per day of nine and a half hours; and in no single instance has this been accomplished without a strenuous effort on the part of the unions. There is scarcely a trade in the country having a union in which wages have not had an upward tendency, and there is hardly a single trade having no union in which wages have not had a downward tendency, or been absolutely stationary, for years. Yes, some of the employers say, they have forced up wages to that point which makes it impossible to carry on trade; it drove iron-shipbuilding from the Thames, to the Tyne and Clyde, and they alleged that it was

driving it from our shores altogether. The men naturally replied: If you will only tell us where it is gone, we will follow it. The pride of nationality would give way in the case of the workmen, as it has sometimes done with employers; cosmopolitanism would then take its place, possibly to the injury of national interests.

§ 9. The absurd accusation, that the shipwrights of London drove the trade of shipbuilding away from the banks of the Thames, has been answered over and over again. Mr. Samuda, himself a large employer, refuted the contention that the disaster was due to the demands of the men; and Lord Brassey collected and published abundant evidence in disproof of the assertions so persistently made against the workmen. Several causes may be assigned for the collapse of shipbuilding on the Thames. Coal and iron were more accessible on the banks of the Clyde, the Tyne, and the Tees than they were in London, and the value of land was also considerably less; but the immediate cause was the downfall of Overend, Gurney & Co., which involved so many in ruin. Besides all this, there was a general depression in shipbuilding everywhere, not in England alone, but on the Continent. Similar allegations have been made from time to time with regard to other industries, most of which are equally erroneous, inapplicable, and without foundation in fact.

§ 10. During the coal-mining mania, in 1871–3, when the price of coal in London was forced up to 45*s.* per ton, and even higher, the miner was accused of being the cause of those outrageously high prices, yet the actual extra price paid to the miner, at the highest point, did not exceed 1*s.* 1½*d.* per ton. Who pocketed the difference? Echo answers, Who? It is easy to see how the public was gulled. Take an instance. In October, 1871, the price of coal in West Yorkshire was 10*s.* per ton; from October to the following August, a succession of advances brought it up to 15*s.* 5*d.* per ton; then came a sudden rise of 5*s.* per ton, to which the merchants added another 10*d.*, making a total of 21*s.* 3*d.* per ton, or a rise of 11*s.* 3*d.* per ton before it left Yorkshire. Then came the merchants' additional profits in London. During the whole of that period the

advance in wages to the collier only amounted to 9*d.* per ton. How, then, was the public gulled? In this way. When the miner demanded a rise of 25 per cent., it sounded exorbitant, but 25 per cent. on 2*s.* 2½*d.* only amounted to a fraction over 6½*d.*, or a rise of wages from 2*s.* 2½*d.* to 2*s.* 9*d.*, whereas a rise of 25 per cent. on the price of coal, taking it at 15*s.* 5*d.*, amounted to 3*s.* 10½*d.* per ton. No wonder that coal-owners and merchants tried to cover their own extravagant demands by abusing the colliers, and accusing them of indulging in champagne breakfasts, and what not. How sober-minded, thoughtful people could be imposed on by those absurd reports is a mystery more difficult to solve than spirit-rapping.

§ 11. It was announced in the newspapers some years ago that a great ironmaster could no longer carry on his works, and that he was about to retire from his arduous labours. Rumour says that this large employer realised a fortune of seven millions sterling. Many less modest men would be glad to retire on a seventh of that sum. The ironworkers ought to have covered their heads with shame, when they thought of the sad catastrophe, and all due to their misconduct. Examples could be given of men who made immense fortunes, lived extravagantly, spent recklessly, and brought ruin upon themselves and their creditors, and then declared that it was all due to the action of their workmen. Happily, all employers are not of this class; but the good ones do not often indulge in clap-trap of this character.

§ 12. As a remedy for the state of things brought about by British workmen, employers devised the importation of foreign labour, for the purpose of competing with the more obdurate Britisher. It has been tried several times and failed. The later attempt made in 1876 was also unsuccessful. The comparison instituted by Lord Brassey as to the comparative cost of labour in various countries, taking into consideration the price paid, and the work done, shows that the increased price paid in England is more than compensated for by the amount of work accomplished, and by the solidity of the workmanship. So far as corroborative evidence can be procured, it favours Lord Brassey's conclusions. In building operations, in the

mechanical arts, in all industries where it is necessary to combine strength and solidity, with finish of execution, the British workman maintains his ground for general excellence, including superiority in skill and dexterity of manipulation. The "foreigner" often excels in beauty of design, and fine workmanship, especially in articles for personal embellishment or decoration; but whether or not there is any disparity between these rivals, it is the height of imprudence to intensify industrial contests with a special, and almost forced, immigration. If English employers think that foreign workmen will best suit their purpose, the English workmen may take it into their heads that foreign employers will answer their purpose equally well; a pretty pass things would then come to, the responsibility for which will rest entirely with the employers.

§ 13. In two or three instances this game was being played in 1877. The London masons struck for 10*d.* an hour; they alleged that they were justified on the grounds of political economy, which says, that when the demand is in excess of the supply, prices will inevitably go up. The demand for masons was greater than the supply—ergo, they had the right to an advance in wages. The question of opportuneness does not here come in; that is altogether beside the mark. The reply of the masters was that they could not afford to pay the advance; hence the strike. Now, what followed? The men who declared that they could not afford to pay the higher wages demanded, to their skilled hands in London, went to an enormous expense in advertising, and sending agents all over the world, in order to procure less skilful men to supply the places of those on strike. What became of their theory that they could not afford the advance, when they spent double in another direction? Their facts, or their logic, or both, were at fault—the argument could not hold water for a single moment. It was precisely the same with regard to the joiners' strike at Manchester and Wolverhampton. Even if the imported craftsmen were not absolutely inferior in skill and ability to those whom they are intended to supplant, it stands to reason that they require considerable training before they can adapt themselves to the methods and practices, most of which are quite new to them,

usual in English workshops. Again, the cost of interpreters, and the inevitable losses from misunderstandings on the part of labourers, fixers, and others, render their labour much dearer than the advanced price demanded would have amounted to. Here is an arithmetical question for economists to solve. Given 1,700 masons at one penny per hour advance in wages on a two-years' contract; set off against this the importation of 1,700 men at an average cost of £5 each, add thereto for expenses in the shape of agency, advertising, and numerous other items, at least another £5, in addition to which there are incidental losses which must be considerable; it will be found that the cost of labour is greater in the latter case, than it would have been in the former. If the advance of wages amounted to £50,000, the cost of importation could not be less than £42,500, irrespective of incidental losses, which cannot well be estimated.

§ 14. It is but fair to say that many employers, and even some of those who were engaged in the contests then raging in London and Manchester, regarded with disfavour, and, it may be said, with positive dislike, the attempts which were made to import contingents of foreign workmen, to supplant those on strike. Not only were they unwilling to promote such a system of immigration, but in many instances they absolutely repudiated the scheme altogether, as one fraught with unforeseen difficulties and dangers. As a mere question of right, abstractedly considered, no doubt employers could justify the action taken; the mode of procedure, however, was not quite so clear, for the workmen imported declared that they were not informed that a strike existed. The masters denied this; and it is quite possible that a certain amount of misunderstanding might have arisen in consequence of the foreign workmen's ignorance of our language, or through a misapprehension of the facts and circumstances of the case, the whole of which could only be explained on their arrival in this country. Again, the employers may have been explicit enough in their instructions to their agents, but these, being paid by results, would naturally strive to obtain, and send over, the greatest possible number, trusting to the employers to retain as many of them as they were able when they

arrived here. That a large percentage of those who reached our shores were not informed of the existence of a strike, or were so misinformed that they did not comprehend its meaning, is evident from what took place on their arrival in this country. If the battle of labour has to be fought on the basis of foreign competition, by imported workmen, at least those whose services are engaged abroad ought to know beforehand the object and intention of such importation, and that they are expected to take the places of those on strike. If under such circumstances they voluntarily agree to the terms offered, and accept the conditions, the question as between them and our own native workmen assumes quite another aspect, and will have to be contested on quite other grounds. If, on the other hand, foreigners are misled, entrapped, or cajoled, there may be occasion to apply to their respective ambassadors for redress for any wrong done. The peculiar legal and international question which may then arise, involving delicate and intricate cases of compensation, it is not now necessary to debate, for the law of contract would be adequate to ensure justice.

§ 15. Conceding, then, the right of employers to hire foreign workmen, to compete with those at home, as a matter of policy it is open to many objections. It is well to ask whether it is wise to embitter a controversy, at all times angry enough, by any course of action which leaves a sting behind not easily to be removed? This has often been done in the past on both sides—the workmen by coercion and intimidation, the employers by prosecutions; in all cases with baneful results. This bitterness will be acutely intensified by any attempt to supplant native industry, by importing workmen from abroad. It will be further intensified if the agents employed are guilty of misrepresentation, or of withholding facts which would give quite another complexion to the whole affair, and which possibly would have induced the foreigners to remain at home, instead of coming here to take the places of workmen engaged in a struggle with their employers. Germans, Frenchmen, Belgians, Swiss, and Italians, as well as Americans and Canadians, are not a whit less anxious to win the best terms they can for their labour, and they are equally patriotic in standing by each other

during a contest. One thing is sure to happen, as a consequence of attempts to promote the importation of foreign workmen, namely, the growth of what is termed the solidarity of the working classes all over the world, and possibly the resuscitation of the now almost forgotten "International Society," which would be more intensely political and aggressive in its aims, than any of our trade unions now are, or than they can possibly be, as at present organised, for many years to come. Whether or not this is a thing to be desired, will depend upon the views entertained by those who condescend to give the matter a moment's thought; in any case, capitalists of all kinds and classes, employers, traders, landed proprietors, or those with fixed incomes, have more to lose by such an amalgamation of forces than the workmen. It is for them, therefore, to consider this phase of the question. It may also be asked: Is it wise to seek a temporary victory by the employment of expedients which may end more disastrously than a defeat? It is of very little use appealing to the spirit of patriotism in this matter. When passions and prejudices are aroused, men will override all higher instincts in moments of strife, and employ means which on calmer reflection they would condemn. It is well, therefore, that this aspect should be put before them. Is it judicious to employ foreign aid, in order to vanquish native workmen? In the case of war, the employment of what are termed "mercenary troops," collected from other nations, is generally condemned; they are regarded with distrust, even by those whom they serve; and, as a rule, Governments proclaim the illegality of the practice, and try to prevent its being carried out. The cases are not quite parallel, but the consequences may be equally disastrous. Already the seeds of discontent are being sown; those who have returned to their native homes are so many missionaries; those left behind will preach a kind of socialism more to be dreaded than the "false economy of trade unions;" and it must ever be recollected that those who sow the wind must not complain if they reap the whirlwind.*

* The accuracy of the statement in the text has been verified; the prediction has come true. The history of the last few years shows that we are reaping an abundant harvest from the seeds sown, each after its kind.

§ 16. The workmen have need also to ponder over some things, carefully and well. The law gives equal freedom, and affords the same protection to foreigners, as to native workmen. Any attempted restriction with regard to the free access of foreign-born craftsmen, to British markets, would be as baneful in its results, as it would be unwise in policy. The molestation of strangers is even more to be deprecated, than of native workmen at home, the latter being able to protect themselves. Moreover, foreign markets are generally open to British workmen, on equal terms, and nearly always at higher rates than those paid to native workmen in the country to which they emigrate. Lastly, foreign workmen are not at all times in a position to judge as to the precise differences which exist between the contending parties; and English workmen are not the only men in the world who can boast of possessing aspirations for progress, or who seek social improvement. These feelings are shared by others less able, perhaps, at present to realise the full blessings of that liberty which is asserted to be the birthright of every British-born subject. Every attempt, therefore, to intimidate or coerce, even in the mildest form, those who have been induced to come to England, must be scrupulously avoided. Kindliness, and frank explanations, will best serve the purpose of men on strike, while, at the same time, it is the only true and just method with which to deal with strangers. It is not intended by these remarks to imply that any other mode has been adopted, in any single case; but when angry feelings are aroused, restraint is forgotten. Should this happen, it would be a blunder as well as an offence. Happily, coercion of every kind was avoided by the English workmen on strike. The foolish hooting and yelling, followed by disturbances, which occurred in the neighbourhood of the Law Courts, appear to have been the work of some of the dwellers in and about Clare Market, a district abounding in a class of rovers, wanderers without fixed trades, and persons "having no visible means of existence," many of whom evinced a fondness for horseplay, coarse jokes, and other rough kinds of sport. That ill-timed outbreak of scoffing, rowdyism, and ruffianism, seems to have been caused by the oddity of the costumes of the Italian workmen, which the youths of that district

thought well suited for special attention; this was naturally resented, and hence a free fight ensued.

§ 17. Whatever actual interference took place in connection with the strike, and the subsequent importation of foreign workmen, was alleged to have been by the police, who violated the law by accosting the workmen, and by threatening to "run them in." In Manchester they actually took a number of men to the police-station, and charged them with obstruction, simply because they walked through certain streets, although they never accosted any one, caused no obstruction, and did not even speak to a single individual. Those cases never came before the magistrates, for the simple reason that the inspector on duty discharged the men with a caution, a course of proceeding which was in direct violation of the law, for no inspector, or any other policeman, has the right to assume magisterial duties and responsibilities; that is a function above and beyond the scope of their authority. In one instance, in London, a member of the Masons' Committee had to appeal to the secretary of the Master Builders' Association for protection, for a policeman actually laid hold of him to intercept him from speaking peaceably to another man. This was in itself an obstruction, and an assault at law. The "force" was not in the best of odour at that moment, and if it be used as a means whereby to coerce the workmen, in cases where labour disputes exist, the ratepayers will have something to say in the matter. The working classes, especially, must take the question up, and demand an inquiry into the working, pay, and conduct of those whose duty it is to protect persons and property—to keep the peace, not endanger it, whenever the police exceed their duty. The matter is serious when quiet and orderly men are interfered with, in the interests of a class, and when "members of the force" presume to act as judges in labour disputes, and assume the right of deciding as to who is right and who is wrong.

§ 18. It would be altogether unnecessary, and even out of place, to notice merely local disputes, with their attendant circumstances and incidents, were it not that principles are at stake, which are capable of a much wider application, and involving considerations which cannot be too clearly defined. The

action taken in London and Manchester was pernicious in its influence, for it extended to a wider area, and to other trades. If the prevention of evil is better than its cure, it is wise to take cognisance of all possible consequences which may arise from the importation of foreign workmen, and the employment of the police force whenever a strike takes place, either with regard to wages, hours of labour, or other controversial matters incidental to our industrial system. The free exercise of the right to earn one's living by one's own craft is not called in question; the foreigner and the native-born workman must have fair play. There can be little doubt that Englishmen will fraternise with their *confrères* of other countries, and welcome them, if they come here to seek a living upon equal terms; but the terms are not equal when the one is played off against the other, as they were in these particular cases. Military and naval men have often threatened us with invasion from one quarter or another, timid people have grown alarmed, the estimates have been increased and voted with alacrity; but the dreaded evils of foreign occupation will be minimised in the minds of working men, if they discover that foreigners after all are their own flesh and blood, and that it is just as possible to flourish under one kind of occupation as under another. If this feeling once gained the ascendency, an appeal to patriotism might be as futile as it was to those who were prepared to beat their workmen with the aid of those who may appear fair to the sight, but who, in the end, might turn out a kind of Dead Sea apple, to the disgust of those who planted the tree in our midst.

§ 19. Of strikes in general, it may be said, that those which have taken place in regard to apprentices, employment of non-union workmen, unskilled labour, or the methods of working, are the least satisfactory, both in their character and results. Many of them have been obstinate and costly, and they have seldom been productive of much good to those engaged in the contest, whichever side may have won. As a general rule, they are injurious rather than otherwise to the workmen, even when, in particular instances, they have terminated in their favour. Take, for example, apprentices. The Typographical Association alone has spent a large sum during the last thirty years in

trying to maintain their apprenticeship rules—and with what result? In some cases they won, in others they failed; but, as a matter of fact, many of the "offices" were either closed, or were permitted to evade it, by working under local rules, or a local union was established because they could not carry out the society's rules. Masons and bricklayers have struck, because of some infringement of their rules as to fixing work, or other matters of secondary importance. The victory in any case is not worth the cost; it is like setting a piece of elaborate machinery in motion, in order to destroy a fly. The unions have higher objects than these to aim at. They should husband their resources for the great struggles which from time to time arise in connection with rates of wages, and hours of work; or any other question which is deemed of sufficient importance to be contested, in the interest of the whole body of unionists. If the money too often spent in mere side issues, was used for the purpose of perfecting their organisation, extending its area, and inducing non-members to join, there would be little need, even from their own point of view, for engaging in contests which, when successful, leave no tangible benefits or useful results behind. The two really great questions to be fought out are wages, and working hours; these require all their energy, funds, and combined strength. When this is properly understood by the unions, strikes, even for these objects, will be fewer than they now are.

§ 20. It is somewhere said, that "Treason never prospers, what's the reason? If it prospers, none dare call it treason." In like manner, in social struggles, many people measure the wisdom or folly of strikes by their success or failure. This, however, is not always a true test; many of those which are failures at the moment, are future successes; and some of those pronounced to be failures, are simply compromises which are practically equivalent to victories. This was pre-eminently the case with the building operatives, in their contests from 1859 to 1862; they did not win the nine hours, but they obtained the Saturday half-holiday, and an advance of wages, which has been enjoyed by the scores of thousands of building operatives in London ever since, and has formed the vantage ground for

claiming new concessions, each advance being based on the terms previously secured. If, therefore, the value of the unions be estimated by results, they are sufficiently numerous and important to justify their existence; and the strikes dating from the commencement of the present century have well repaid the workmen for the suffering endured, and all the trouble and expenditure which they have cost the unions, during this period. The only considerations which are necessary to be seriously impressed upon unionists are—moderation in their demands, careful calculation as to time and circumstances, and prudent management. These conditions fulfilled, their progress will be continuous and permanent; checked here and there for a while, it may be, but this will serve only as breathing time, after which they will advance with fresh vigour towards the goal of their ambition and dearest hopes—"a fair day's wage for a fair day's work."

§ 21. According to popular notions, strikes are peculiar to working men. This may be true, in a certain sense. By trade unions they are methodised and systematised, but they are not confined to trade unionists. Disputes from time to time arise so wondrously like strikes in all their main features, that it is hard to distinguish where to draw the line. In October, 1876, there appeared in *The Times* a quiet little paragraph, which attracted no attention at the time, but which, if all the facts had been explained, would have much resembled a strike, or a threatened strike, of the judges of England. The facts appear to have been these. By the new regulations of the then Lord Chancellor, the judges were required to give up a portion of their vacation, and go on circuit; to this the judges demurred. Consequently, they held a meeting, and discussed their grievance; *The Times* said that they came to no conclusion, which really meant that they declined to abide by the terms of the Lord Chancellor's new regulations. They separated without a decision; meanwhile, the Home Office and the Lord Chancellor conferred. The judges met again, and a compromise was effected, by which it was arranged that some of the judges should go on circuit, and that commissions were to be specially appointed to do a portion of the extra duty. Then came a paragraph announcing this

arrangement, but not a word was said as to the threatened strike. The judges declined to try prisoners, when they should be seeking recreation or pleasure. The authorities thought themselves justified in making and insisting on the new regulations. The judges—workmen in this case—objected; here was a standstill. The second consultation brought about a compromise or an arrangement, by which a strike was averted, and society saved a scandal. It was wondrously like the action taken by workmen, in all its chief features, only that timely concession prevented the final act being played, and obviated what would otherwise have been a strike or a lock-out of the judges of England.

§ 22. Some years before that, the Treasury was in a state of ferment. Mr. Ayrton had been appointed a Lord of the Treasury, and he, being full of vigour and work, wanted to be busy. He was busy, and his interference produced great discontent. There were all the elements of a strike boiling and foaming beneath the surface, but they cooled down, and a strike was prevented by the timely removal of Mr. Ayrton to another department. The same results followed on his being appointed as Chief Commissioner of Works. Controversies arose which culminated in a dispute with Dr. Hooker at Kew Gardens; this contention was only settled after a long wrangle, and much heart-burning. Other incidents could be cited from "official circles," such as the controversies of the Chief Constructor of the Navy, and many more, all of which very nearly approximate to a strike, in character, procedure, and general results. Cases constantly arise in commerce and trade which closely resemble the strikes of the working classes, but they are not chronicled with the same distinctness of outline, and they do not evoke the same kind of condemnation. Strikes are occasioned by a sense of injustice, or a supposed injustice, in one form or another, and they can never be stamped out until men act fairly, honestly, and equitably in all their dealings—doing unto others as they would that men should do unto them.

II.—FOREIGN COMPETITION.

§ 23. Intimately associated with the question of strikes, or rather with the discussions which have taken place in connection with them, is the subject of foreign competition. To such an extent is this the case, that almost every fluctuation in the imports and exports of the country, when they have a downward tendency, is attributed to the action of the workmen, who, it is alleged, are driving the trade away from our shores, by their perverseness, their obstinacy, their high wages, their short hours of labour, their restrictions and limitations, and by the badness of the work which they turn out. If these allegations were true, in substance and in fact, it need scarcely be said that a heavy responsibility would rest upon the men who had been guilty of such extreme folly; and, moreover, they would feel its disastrous effects even more than the trading and commercial classes. It is asserted that trade unions are the cause of all this mischief, because by their restrictive rules and regulations they enable workmen to exact more than a fair price for their labour, and so limit production that employers are unable to compete with foreigners in foreign and neutral markets, and that even in our home markets they are fast becoming our masters.

The whole matter resolves itself into the following questions:

a. What is the meaning of the cry of foreign competition?

b. Is it true that we are being beaten in the markets of the world?

c. What are the causes of the alleged decline in our imports and exports when the decline occurs?

d. To what extent do the workmen contribute thereto?

e. What other causes are in operation to produce the results complained of?

§ 24. (*a*) What is the meaning of this outcry about foreign competition? What does it comprehend? And what are the essential principles involved in its discussion? The meaning seems to be this. For a long period the British people have taken the lead in industrial pursuits; while other nations have been fighting, we have been manufacturing and trading; our

insular position has favoured commercial enterprise, and our limited area has rendered it an absolute necessity. Being unable to supply our needs, by our own produce, we seek food from all quarters of the globe. In seeking for food, and other necessaries not grown at home, it was requisite that we should pay in money or in kind; there was need of barter and exchange, as well as purchase; some nations preferred taking the goods which we were able to manufacture, to their exchangeable value in gold. The almost inexhaustible supply of coal and iron gave us a start in the mechanical arts, and the genius of our inventors and discoverers enabled us to utilise these two great forces, and thereby to produce machinery which, being applied to productive purposes, gave us the power to manufacture faster and better than any other nation in the universe. Everything was in our favour; we had the start, and we were determined, as far as possible, to keep ahead of all other countries in the art of production. And a noble ambition it was. It has given us unbounded power and wealth; our commercial influence has far exceeded our military and naval strength, and has been instrumental in maintaining our position, as the chief among the nations. As to our wealth, we have found most of the capital for developing the industries of our competitors, and in many cases have taught them the whole of the arts in connection therewith. The extent of our wealth is sufficiently proven by the fact that, having so much of it, we lend it to all the rotten States in the world, and to questionable enterprises all over the globe.

§ 25. It was scarcely to be expected that we should be left in full and undisputed possession of the field of productive industry, with no attempt to dispute our authority, or to test our right to this supremacy for ever. Rivalry sprang up in many quarters, first in those trades which did not require the appliances of expensive and complicated machinery, then in the latter industries themselves, and lastly in the manufacture of the machinery itself. In the latter case it has been chiefly restricted to countries which, like ourselves, have an abundance of coal and iron, and singularly enough in these departments, they have

obtained our inventions, and gained their position, by the employment of British workmen, or by sending men to this country to get experience, which they then take home, and use for their own profit. We had no right to expect that we could for ever monopolise the markets of the world, in so far as production is concerned. It was natural that other nations should seek to produce their own wares, whenever possible ; and in numerous instances they sought to accomplish this by protecting native industry, and by taxing our commodities up to the hilt. Because we have not been able in some cases to compete in price with Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians, Swiss, and Americans, on their own soil, with all the disadvantages of having to pay high duties, and cost of transit, not only on the manufactured goods sent abroad, but for transit of the raw materials brought here, out of which the articles are manufactured, it is complained that we are losing ground, and forfeiting our proud pre-eminence. Even were this true, to the full extent stated, it would not be surprising, when all the circumstances are considered. Some employers have complained that Industrial Exhibitions have had a disastrous effect on our trade, for we have not only shown our inventions, but have actually furnished to our rivals specifications and plans, free of cost, which have been used to the disadvantage of native manufacturers.* Then, again, the Patent Laws of this country were in themselves very harassing to inventors, by reason of their costliness, delays, and general inconvenience. The labour of English workmen has, in fact, been handicapped by foreign duties and other things, to such an extent, that the wonder is that we have been able to hold our own as well as we have done, in our export trade, or to contend against the adverse influences brought to bear against us.

§ 26. (*b*) After all that has been said and written, is it true, as alleged, that we are being driven out of foreign markets, and beaten in our own? This question can only be answered relatively ; but some facts and figures, if they are candidly considered, will aid us in coming to a decision. A quantity of goods sold in the

* The complaint against Exhibitions is not well founded. They merely made manifest to us the strides which had been made by our competitors.

English market, labelled as French goods, are made in England; but some ladies are so prejudiced in favour of French goods, that dealers resort to a convenient fiction, and label the goods as French, although made at home. The boots and shoes sold as French, are mostly made in Northampton, Leicester, or in Somersetshire; similarly "French" ribbons and silks are made at Coventry, Macclesfield, or Bethnal Green; and French gloves are manufactured at Worcester. If persons have a kind of Franco-mania, by all means satisfy their taste, and give them "French" goods; but it is a pity that British workmen should suffer in reputation, if not in pocket.* Still it must be admitted that, in certain kinds of goods, foreigners surpass us. The Swiss and the French beat us in watches and clocks; the Germans in pipes, cigar-cases, purses, etc.; the French, in articles for personal adornment, especially those for female wear, such as artificial flowers, and the like, and in a number of small articles designated *bric-à-brac*.

§ 27. But in trades which require great skill, solidity, and accurate mechanical knowledge, the British workman of to-day stands unrivalled. Some countries excel us in beauty and design, and in the more graceful arts of delicacy in workmanship; this is due to their higher technical training, a matter so long neglected at home, but which, if properly attended to, will enable our own workmen to rival those of any other country. Take, for instance, brooches. Some of those imported from France and Italy are splendid specimens of artistic skill, beauty of design, and finish; take, again, some of the ornaments manufactured at Whitby, and its neighbourhood, out of jet, and they will find that the latter will compare favourably with anything sent us from abroad. And if, after all, there has been a decline in some articles of trade, the variations in fashion, consequent on the fickleness of taste, will account for many of the changes which from time to time have taken place, especially

* Recent legislation, by the Merchandise Marks Act, has effected a change in this respect; some now demand an extension of its provisions so as to compel the marking of all goods. At present the law is restricted to "fraudulent marking."

in articles of embellishment, fancy, and decoration, personal and domestic. There are, however, some things in which foreign competition has scarcely touched us, notwithstanding all that has been said. In building operations, for instance, threats of an importation of doors, sashes, and other articles used in building construction, have been freely uttered, and in some few cases a portion of a cargo has, with a great flourish of trumpets, reached our ports, and then we hear no more of them. Some of these importations seem to have been designed as mere bogies to frighten the operatives, but they utterly failed to produce the intended effect.

§ 28. During the last four years we have heard little of "foreign competition," the scare having either died out or the subject, for some reason or the other, is kept in the background. During the four years, 1877 to 1880 inclusive, and again during the three years, 1884 to 1886 inclusive, great prominence was given to the question, even to the extent of its being raised at parliamentary elections, as one of the issues to be considered by the electorate. The matter, however, is merely in abeyance; its discussion is suspended, but the ideas that underlie it are not abandoned. When the flush of trade is over, when industrial activity has spent itself, when employment becomes scarcer, then the old controversies will again arise, and foreign competition will revive with the rest. It is important, therefore, that attention should still be directed to this subject, as in the former issue of this work.

§ 29. If we follow the growth of our import and export trade from the year 1700—from which year the figures are available, though not regularly published by the Custom House until after 1759—to the present year, 1890, a period of nearly two centuries, we shall find that the acts relating to commerce are anything but discouraging. There have been many fluctuations, but all, or most of them, can be satisfactorily explained, whether they arise from political causes, occasional panics in trade, or in consequence of over-stimulated production in some years, to be followed by depression in succeeding years, or otherwise. Few will deny that steady progress is better for the nation than

spasmodic leaps. British progress in trade has been continuous and marvellous. The development of our commerce has gone on in an increasing ratio, unexampled in any part of the world. The leap in our exports from 244 millions sterling, in 1870, to 283 millions in 1871, and then again to 314 millions in 1872, or even the lesser amount of 310 millions in 1873, was an expansion in trade, the ratio of which could not be maintained. No man in his senses, whose opinions are at all worth considering, would argue, or assume, that it could go on increasing at that rapid rate. Taking, however, the decade dating from 1867, and comparing the figures with the succeeding decade, from 1877, both periods show enormous expansion, even when due allowance is made for the gigantic strides in 1871, 1872, and 1873, and the subsequent depression in 1877, 1878, and 1879. The growth in fact fairly represents the normal progress of the commerce of the country. It must be borne in mind that the falling off in imports or exports is often more apparent than real. Neither may be due to any diminution in quantity, but to difference in values or prices; with the latter, the workmen can have little to do. Even in the years of depression in trade, the falling off in British exports was inconsiderable, if at all, in quantities, the decrease being almost wholly in values. The fall in prices may be, and is, attributed to a variety of causes, nearly all of which are entirely and absolutely beyond the sphere of trade union influence, however eager the members may be to exercise it, if they had the power. Nevertheless, the same accusations will be made, and the same arguments will be used, as heretofore, until at least the whole community is sufficiently informed to discern the falsity of the accusations, and the worthlessness of arguments, based upon so slender a foundation. Prejudice is hard to uproot, and almost impossible to eradicate, but time is working wonders in this respect.

§ 30. The accompanying figures in following tables will serve to illustrate the continuous growth of the aggregate trade of the United Kingdom, as shown in the values of imports and exports, respectively, separately and combined, dating from the year 1700, down to the year 1890. The official values are given in the first table, the observations on which will show the

difference between the official value, and the real or declared value.

Years.	Total Imports of Foreign and Colonial Merchandise.		Years.	Total Exports of British and Irish Produce and Manufactures.	
	Official Values.	Official Values.		Official Values.	Official Values.
	£	Decennial averages as given by J. R. McCulloch in his Statistical Account of the British Empire.		£	Decennial averages as given by J. R. McCulloch in his Statistical Account of the British Empire.
1700	4,753,777		1700	6,097,720	
1750	7,289,582		1750	10,139,991	
1775	14,815,855		1775	14,326,363	
1800	24,066,700		1800	20,556,637	
	Real or Declared Values.			Official Values.	
1801	31,786,262	£	1801	24,927,684	£
1810	39,301,612	28,809,778	1810	34,061,901	25,856,050
1820	32,438,650	30,864,670	1820	38,395,625	35,525,775
1830	46,245,241	39,661,123	1830	61,140,864	48,811,059
1840	65,873,411	53,487,465	1840	102,263,512	79,676,883
1850	100,460,433	79,192,806	1850	175,437,098	131,496,012
1851	110,679,125	...	1851	190,658,314	...
1852	109,345,409	...	1852	192,216,610	...

The figures given by various writers, for the above period, do not in all cases agree. Those by Mr. J. R. Porter do not accord with those of Mr. J. R. McCulloch, while those of Mr. John Taylor differ in some instances from both. Neither of the preceding writers is perhaps quite correct. The Statistical Abstract from 1840 to 1853 inclusive, and thenceforward, is the most reliable. The differences in the figures are, however, immaterial for our purpose. Irish produce is not included in the years 1801 to 1804, as the figures cannot be given; but at that date it was inconsiderable, while the exports of foreign and colonial produce are excluded in the first table, these being in point of fact simply re-exports of imports. The official values differ very materially from the real or declared values; the former being fixed in 1694, and not varying thereafter, is considered by Mr. McCulloch to be a fair index to the quantities exported. On this basis he calculated that between 1800 and

1853 our annual exports increased in quantity eightfold, while in values, or price, they only increased twofold. As all subsequent statistics are based upon the real or declared value, the annual averages of these are here given in decennial periods as a basis of comparison with the figures from 1853. The decennial averages of exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures, for the first fifty years of the present century, were as follows: From 1801 to 1810, £40,737,970; from 1811 to 1820, £41,484,461; from 1821 to 1830, £36,600,536; from 1831 to 1840, £45,144,407; and from 1841 to 1850, £57,381,293. The annual averages in the next three years, 1851 to 1853 inclusive, were £83,819,786. The foregoing figures constitute a fair groundwork for instituting comparisons in all subsequent periods. Up to that date the cry of foreign competition had not assumed the exact form which has been familiar to us in more recent years; but some croaking Cassandras were heard crying in the wilderness, even in those years, and their ominous forebodings helped to retard the progress of free association among the people.

§ 31. From the year 1853 we touch firmer ground, the official returns being more uniform, exact, and reliable. The following summaries give the "real values" of imports and exports of produce and merchandise, as given in the Board of Trade returns, exclusive of bullion and specie.

(*a*) Aggregates of Imports and Exports.

Year and Quinquennial Periods.	Total Imports.		Total Exports.	
	Annual Averages.	Annual Increase or Decrease.	Annual Averages.	Annual Increase or Decrease.
	£	£	£	£
1854	152,389,053	...	115,821,092	...
1855–9	169,539,526	...	139,512,342	...
1860–4	235,520,813	65,981,287+	176,968,801	40,456,459+
1865–9	286,339,904	50,819,091+	229,666,659	49,697,858+
1870–4	346,067,334	59,727,430+	290,179,878	60,513,219+
1875–9	375,055,316	28,987,982+	261,000,433	29,179,445−
1880–4	407,636,362	32,581,046+	298,312,522	37,312,089+
1885–9*	379,666,466	27,969,896−	287,966,708	10,345,814−

* In the last five years imports and exports by Parcel Post are included.

(*b*) NET IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF BRITISH AND IRISH PRODUCE AND MANUFACTURES.

Year and Quinquennial Periods.	Net Imports.		British and Irish Exports.	
	Yearly Averages.	Increase or Decrease.	Yearly Averages.	Increase or Decrease.
	£	£	£	£
1854	133,752,687	...	97,184,726	...
1855–9	146,147,470	12,394,783 +	116,120,825	18,935,559 +
1860–4	193,959,552	47,812,082 +	138,407,540	22,287,255 +
1865–9	237,742,635	43,783,083 +	181,069,391	42,661,851 +
1870–4	290,614,077	52,871,442 +	234,726,611	53,657,220 +
1875–9	319,530,663	28,916,586 +	201,475,781	33,250,830 −
1880–4	343,598,841	24,068,178 +	234,275,000	32,799,219 +
1885–9*	318,733,957	24,864,884 −	228,238,199	6,036,801 −

The last of the two tables really exhibits the course of British trade, the re-export of colonial and foreign produce and manufactures being eliminated from the total imports, and the exports being confined to British and Irish produce and manufactures only.

§ 32. The total imports in 1875 show an increase of 503 per cent., compared with 1840, while the exports increased by 335 per cent. in the same period. The excess of imports over exports is explained by the enormous quantities of food imported, and also of raw materials of various kinds for manufacturing purposes, both for home use and for exportation. The importation of food might be diminished by a more thorough and complete system of tillage in the United Kingdom, the land of which is capable of sustaining even a larger population than now exists. But an increased importation of raw materials for industrial manufacture by the native skill and industry of our people, will add to the prosperity of the country. The figures given in Table *a* show that our imports were greatest from 1880 to 1884, whilst the exports reached the maximum average in 1870 to 1874. After a serious decline in 1875 to 1879, the average from 1880 to 1884 nearly reached the level of the prosperous

* In the last five years imports and exports by Parcel Post are included.

period before attained. In the last five years there has been a decline in the average of £6,036,801 a year. This decrease is wholly due to the low level of prices, ruling generally, for several years past. It is shown conclusively, by index numbers, that the quantities exported have exceeded the averages of any former period. There is one very singular fact in connection with our commerce which deserves attention, namely, that the ratio of our trade with British colonies and possessions is scarcely beyond the ratio in 1854. At that date the proportions were: Imports from foreign countries, 76·8 per cent.; from British colonies and possessions, 23·2 per cent.; in 1888, the proportions were: Foreign, 75·5 per cent.; colonial, 24·5 per cent. Exports to foreign countries in 1854 were 64·9 per cent.; to colonies, 35·1 per cent. In 1888 the proportions were: To foreign countries, 64·8 per cent.; to colonies 35·2 per cent., or only ·1 increase in thirty-five years. When we remember how our colonies have expanded during the period, the stationary relative ratio of our trade is almost alarming.

§ 33. Had it been true, as alleged, that foreign competition was destroying our trade, the relative proportion of exports to foreign countries, as compared with those to British colonies, would not have been maintained. It is, however, stated that the relative growth of foreign export trade, as compared with British trade, has been enormous during the last ten or fifteen years. Those who take the alarmist view quote figures to show that the percentage of growth is not so great with us, as with some foreign countries. That is quite true. But the magnitude of the figures must also be taken into account. For example, 100 per cent. on a million sterling, would simply double the amount, making two millions sterling; but 100 per cent. on British exports, taking the highest point ever reached, namely, in 1882, when they attained £241,467,162, would give the enormous amount of £482,934,324, in one year, a magnitude which the wildest dreamer would hardly expect to realise. America is sometimes pointed to as a formidable competitor in trade. Let us see how it works out: Starting with 1854 as

the basis of comparison, we find that the specie value of the imports of merchandise (five dollars to the £ sterling) in 1854 was £59,524,608; in 1888 they were £144,775,963. The re-exports of merchandise in 1854 amounted to £4,326,252; in 1888 to £2,418,481. Taking the same dates, the net imports of merchandise, less re-exports, amounted, in 1855, to £46,330,168, and in 1888 to £142,357,482; while the domestic exports of merchandise of all descriptions amounted, in 1855, to £38,550,227, while in 1888 they reached a total of £147,312,067. But whereas our exports are mainly manufactured articles, American exports are mainly produce. In 1868 the exports of cotton goods, exclusive of apparel, amounted in value to £1,014,802; and in 1869 to £1,223,796. In 1876 the total value of cotton manufactures was £1,544,596; and in 1877, £2,047,168. In the last two years for which the figures are available, the exports were, in 1887, £2,652,052; and in 1888, £2,267,112. Of course America has a large field for consumption at home; but so also have we.

§ 34. It was frequently asserted that we were losing ground in the production of machinery, mill-work, and iron manufactures generally. The following tables will show whether or not we are fairly holding our own, in so far as exports are concerned.

(*a*) Exports of Machinery—Quinquennial Periods—Yearly Averages.

Years.	Steam Engines.	Other Machinery.	Totals of Machinery of all kinds.
	£	£	£
1854	566,768	1,346,092	1,930,860
1855–9	968,461	2,266,327	3,234,788
1860–4	1,446,705	2,625,448	4,272,154
1865–9	1,864,356	3,095,371	4,959,727
1870–4	2,567,965	5,286,289	7,854,254
1875–9	2,239,071	5,314,750	7,553,821
1880–4	3,597,096	7,935,408	11,532,504
1885–9	3,361,870	8,746,829	12,108,698

(*b*) Exports of Iron and Steel Manufactures—Yearly Averages, as before.

Years.	Iron and Steel Manufactures and Materials.	Other Metallic Goods, including Hardware.	Yearly Averages of Totals.
	£	£	£
1854	12,712,633	7,901,982	20,614,615
1855–9	13,307,991	8,945,249	22,253,240
1860–4	13,569,617	10,281,461	23,851,078
1865–9	18,032,047	10,448,556	28,480,603
1870–4	30,979,974	14,253,978	45,233,952
1875–9	20,881,840	11,916,826	32,798,666
1880–4	28,133,162	13,490,175	41,623,337
1885–9	24,824,168	12,491,243	37,315,410

When the low price of iron and steel during the last few years is taken into account, it becomes obvious that the exports of machinery and mill-work are enormous, the high prices ruling in 1870–74 accounting for the higher averages in those years for all kinds of iron and steel manufactures, and metals in the second table (*b*).

§ 35. Only one other detailed example need be given, showing the growth of British trade, in spite of foreign competition, the one selected being the cotton trade. In this instance the quantities are given, as indicating better than values, the progress which has taken place in our greatest industry. The variations in prices are also given in this case.

Exports of Cotton Manufactures—Quantities—Five Years' Averages.

Years.	Exports of Yarn in Weight.	Average Price per lb.	Exports of Cotton Piece-goods—White or Plain.	Average Price per yd.	Exports of Piece-goods—Dyed, Coloured, or Printed.	Average Price per yd.
	lbs.	Pence.	Yards.	Pence.	Yards.	Pence.
1854	147,128,498	...	1,101,471,222	...	591,427,900	...
1855–9	183,206,857	11·43	1,370,205,958	2·94	797,586,909	4·11
1860–4	119,698,737	19·06	1,338,221,335	4·18	739,762,126	4·98
1865–9	150,911,425	21·81	1,769,166,731	4·32	874,492,627	5·35
1870–4	205,512,387	18·00	2,408,742,515	3·41	1,036,767,086	4·47
1875–9	232,414,562	13·10	2,621,491,680	2·84	1,048,292,593	4·33
1880–4	268,883,200	12·62	3,122,136,200	2·63	1,370,827,620	3·68
1885–8 (4 years)	251,496,800	10·06	3,432,261,260	2·27	1,609,261,277	3·22

The foregoing figures show enormous progressive development in the quantities of cotton goods exported, though the prices realised have not been so good during the last fifteen years. The exports of yarn have fallen off, but Lancashire men agree that this is not due to trade unions, but to other causes. The maximum exports of white or plain goods was reached in 1888, of coloured or printed goods in 1886, and of yarns in 1884. The maximum total value of all cotton goods exported was reached in the five years 1880–84, when the average was £62,877,917 per annum. The next highest yearly average was in 1870–74, and the third highest in the four years ending with 1888. In so far as foreign competition is concerned, Lancashire may rest in peace.

§ 36. In the woollen trades we never have had any serious competition. In those trades the true test is not so much the exports, as in the cotton trade, as it is home consumption. The net average increase of wool imported, in the four years ending with 1888, was nearly 50,000,000 lbs. in each year; while the increased exports of British wool were about 7,750,000 lbs. in each year; and of woollen and worsted yarn about 10,750,000 lbs. in each year. The net imports of wool, after deducting the re-exports, amounted to an annual average of 270,469,824 lbs., as compared with 220,799,556 in the five years 1880–84, and 201,288,616 in the previous five years, 1875–79. These figures do not indicate that we are on the road to ruin. In no department of the textile industries is there any indication of our being beaten by foreign competition, due to trade unionism at home. Other causes may have led to fluctuations, and to lessened exports, but these are matters beyond the scope of our present inquiry, and are therefore not discussed.

§ 37. It was alleged at one time that even our shipping was threatened, first of all by the conduct of English workmen, and then by foreign bounties. Figures need not be quoted in this instance; the ports of the United Kingdom during the last two or three years bear witness to the fact that, in shipbuilding, British workmanship and skill, backed by British capital and enterprise, have enabled us not only to hold our own, but to keep far ahead of all other nations. The Thames, as a great

centre of the shipbuilding trade, no longer occupies a first place. But the Clyde and the Tyne, the Tees and the Wear, with natural advantages as regards iron and coal, which London did not possess, find employment for the shipping trades beyond even the dreams of twenty-five years ago, when trade unionists were accused of driving the shipping trade from the country, by their strikes, and by their rules and regulations, respecting wages and work.

§ 38. If we compare the imports into this country, from certain foreign countries, during the last few years we shall find little cause for real alarm. The following figures indicate the course of imports of manufactured goods for the last five years. America — Cotton goods: in 1885, £347,852; in 1886, £213,624; in 1887, £452,437; in 1888, £259,820; and in 1889, £266,173. Clocks, and parts of clocks: in 1885, £94,699; in 1886, £98,232; in 1887, £207,015; in 1888, £134,686; and in 1889, £155,375. Watches, and parts thereof: in 1885, £22,914; in 1886, £53,497; in 1887, £33,621; in 1888, £53,748; and in 1889, £28,904. Iron and steel manufactures, including sewing machines and unenumerated articles: in 1885, £310,219; in 1886, £260,259; in 1887, £309,946; in 1888, £351,440; and in 1889, £501,172. Of those totals, nearly one-half relate to the value of sewing machines imported. Joiners' work of various kinds stands thus: in 1885, £118,728; in 1886, £132,807; in 1887, £109,653; in 1888, £117,049; and in 1889, £154,826. Musical instruments: in 1885, £126,927; in 1886, £118,901; in 1887, £109,654; in 1888, £137,682; and in 1889, £152,741. Nearly the whole of the other imports from the United States are either raw materials for manufacturing purposes, or food products of one kind and another, with the exception of manufactures of caoutchouc, ranging from £16,046 in 1885 to £50,397 in 1890. The competition of America is not therefore serious up to the present time, in any kind of manufactures which can compete with British made goods.

§ 39. Belgium has long been regarded as a competitor in the British market, and yet the total imports from Belgium, in 1889, only amounted, all told, to £17,674,877; for the preceding

four years the average annually was only £14,921,541; while our exports of British goods and produce to Belgium averaged £7,142,462 during the last five years, or nearly equal to one-half the imports therefrom; besides some six millions sterling a year of foreign and colonial produce. The imports of arms and ammunition decreased from £89,692 to £73,881; china and earthenware stood at £27,508 in 1885, and at £30,713 in 1889. Clocks increased from £42,963 in 1885, to £93,673 in 1889; cotton manufactures from £333,855 to £488,394; glass of all kinds stood at £834,995 in 1885, and at £855,953 in 1889. Bar-iron, and iron and steel manufactures of all kinds, stood thus: in 1885, £749,956; in 1889, £892,479; and this was the industry in which we were specially threatened. Leather manufactures, including boots and shoes and gloves, in 1885 amounted to £385,506, and in 1889 to £535,227. Linen yarn and manufactures increased from £321,441 to £724,154. Silk of all kinds, raw and manufactured, stood at £1,998,098 in 1885, and at £2,319,270 in 1889. Watches in 1885 amounted to £385,430, and fell to £70,014 in 1889. Joiners' work and wood was £15,147 in 1885, and £65,721 in 1889. Woollen manufactures increased from £229,031 in 1885, to £477,777 in 1889; and woollen yarn from £1,255,117 to £1,531,795; and zinc manufactures from £73,271 to £101,761. Here, then, we have all the chief imports of manufactures from Belgium, none of which need frighten the British producer, although in some cases our exports to that country, of similar articles, declined to a small extent.

§ 40. France is another near competitor. The total imports from France have increased from £35,709,787 in 1885, to £45,780,277, or an increase of ten millions sterling; while British exports to France have slightly declined, from £14,978,990 in 1885 to £14,551,294, the aggregate exports, including foreign and colonial produce, have decreased from £23,020,350 to £22,101,222 in the same period of five years. Imports of works of art, other than drawings, pictures, engravings, prints, etc., have increased to some extent, while bronze and brass work have increased from £28,880 in 1885 to £69,662 in 1889; and buttons and studs from £59,832 to £79,244. China and

earthenware exports have also increased from £116,351 to £141,271; clocks and parts of clocks, on the contrary, have declined from £204,239 to £184,249. Cotton manufactures have increased from £384,613 to £506,007, and cotton yarn from £5,170 to £10,749; artificial flowers, from £285,764 to £317,136; glass of all kinds, from £208,638 to £219,052; hats and bonnets, from £28,172 to £32,104; iron and steel, from £101,708 to £140,092; while boots and shoes have declined from £187,147 to £159,311. Other leather manufactures have similarly declined. Silk manufactures have increased from £5,969,686 to £7,178,021; watches and parts thereof, from £216,611 to £584,099; and woollen from £5,229,249 to £6,418,345. These are the chief exports of manufactured goods to this country, and they are not so very formidable after all. In many instances our exports to France have increased in nearly the same ratio, though in many cases there has been a decline in the exports to France of British goods. There is, however, no cause for alarm, and certainly the returns do not support the notion that the British workman is endangering our trade with France.

§ 41. In order that there shall be no possible mistake as to the relative progress of British trade, compared with foreign trade, a few figures might be cited with the view of showing how our chief competitors stand as regards the particular branches of export trade which are said to come into competition with British manufactures. The latest available official returns give the following figures, as the total exports from the respective countries named. Three periods are given in each case, and the several manufactures selected are those in which it is, or was, alleged that they were dangerous competitors.

(*a*) *Cotton Manufactures.*—The total value of exports from Austro-Hungary in 1877 was £589,750; in 1882, £657,416; in 1887, £654,083, and in 1888, £590,083. The exports from Belgium, in value, amounted to £696,320 in 1877; to £903,888 in 1882; to £824,360 in 1887; and to £789,960 in 1888. From France the total exports amounted, in 1877, to £2,488,000; in 1882, to £3,912,000; in 1887, to £4,710,320; and in 1888, to £4,247,320. From Germany the total exports amounted, in 1877, to £2,826,800; in 1882, to £3,656,900; in 1887, to £5,937,000; and in 1888, to £9,317,400. Holland, in 1877,

£1,424,750; in 1882, £1,483,850; in 1887, £2,103,917; and in 1888, £2,287,500. From the United States the total exports amounted, in 1877, to £2,047,200; in 1882, to £2,644,600; in 1887, to £2,985,000; and in 1888, to £2,602,600. The foregoing figures tell the whole tale, in so far as the exports of cotton manufactures are concerned, from the chief manufacturing nations. Of course, it takes no account of the extent to which they supply their own home markets, instead of having to import such goods from England or other countries.

(*b*) *Woollen Manufactures.*—Taking the same periods, the total values of exports of woollen goods were as follows: Austria, in 1877, £2,092,833; in 1882, £2,502,083; in 1887, £2,093,833; and in 1888, £2,075,833. Belgium, in 1877, £1,367,800; in 1882, £1,215,200; in 1887, £938,500; and in 1888, £1,013,840. France, in 1877, £13,004,000; in 1882, £16,076,000; in 1887, £14,017,880; and in 1888, £12,935,040. Germany, in 1877, £8,558,050; in 1882, £8,878,950; in 1887, £9,001,350; and in 1888, to £9,487,400. Holland, in 1877, £358,000; in 1882, £466,750; in 1887, £379,417; and in 1888, £407,500. The foregoing represent the aggregate exports of woollen goods.

(*c*) *Silk Manufactures.*—Austria, in 1877, £763,416; in 1882, £868,167; in 1887, £1,526,416; and in 1888, £1,638,833. France, in 1877, £10,368,000; in 1882, £11,581,920; in 1887, £8,392,280; and in 1888, £8,926,940. Germany, in 1877, £3,515,000; in 1882, £8,499,750; in 1887, £9,792,550; and in 1888, £9,121,300. Italy, in 1877, £421,040; in 1882, £457,200; in 1887, £646,080; and in 1888, £584,120. The foregoing represent the aggregate exports of silk manufactures.

(*d*) *Iron and Steel Manufactures.* — Austria, in 1877, £1,573,250; in 1882, £1,392,416; in 1887, £1,223,666; and in 1888, £957,417. Belgium, under all heads, in 1877, £4,524,680; in 1882, £4,936,760; in 1887, £3,180,200; and in 1888, £2,687,760. France, under all heads, in 1877, £2,332,000; in 1882, £2,667,280; in 1887, £2,913,520; and in 1888, £2,840,440. Germany, under all heads, in 1877, £6,200,350; in 1882, £9,812,050; in 1887, £7,775,600; and in 1888, £8,795,650. Holland, in 1877, £2,847,750; in 1882, £5,345,416; in 1887, £3,859,417; and in 1888, £3,695,833.

The United States, in 1877, £3,587,207; in 1882, £4,634,800; in 1887, £3,639,400; and in 1888, £4,081,600. The above are the aggregate exports of iron and steel manufactures from all the chief countries, exclusive of England.

(*e*) *General Manufactures.*—In addition to the foregoing chief manufactures exported, the following may be given: Austro-Hungary exported leather amounting, in 1877, to £1,457,000; in 1882, to £1,767,500; in 1887, to £1,992,416; and in 1888, to £2,088,250. Glass of all kinds, in 1877, amounting to £1,303,750; in 1882, to £1,679,000; in 1887, to £1,703,417; and in 1888, to £1,418,750. France exported paper manufactures amounting, in 1877, to £2,104,000; in 1882, to £2,091,880; in 1887, to £1,798,440; and in 1888, to £1,730,320. No other exports of consequence need be enumerated.*

The foregoing comprise all the principal articles of export which can come into competition with goods of British manufacture, from all the competing nations. The extent and seriousness of that competition may be a matter of opinion; but from the trade union point of view very little danger can be traced to the action of the unions from any or all of the rules and regulations in force relating to wages, work, hours of labour, restrictive action in the matter of output, apprentices, or other conditions of employment in this country. Whatever their faults, trade unionists cannot really be charged with having driven the trade from the country, or of having made it impossible for British manufacturers to compete.

§ 42. (*c*) The causes of the "decline in trade," apparent and real, are obvious enough to those who look beneath the surface. For a long series of years there have been alternate periods of great industrial activity, and of comparative depression. At one time production is carried on at high-pressure speed; then comes a check, a lull, and partial stagnation. Bankruptcies follow, panics ensue, sometimes banks stop payment, and the whole of the trading, commercial, and moneyed classes are thrown into a state of ferment, uncertainty, and perplexity, with the result that industrial enterprise collapses for the time being. But these

* See Appendix, Foreign Competition.

alternations of briskness and of dulness, in varying degrees, are scarcely to be wondered at, when we remember that our powers of production have increased more rapidly than our means of consumption; hence a glut is almost certain to follow a period of great activity. Not only are the mechanical powers of production vastly increased by more perfect machinery, and division of labour; but keener competition between rival manufacturers imparts a motive and an impetus to further increased production. New mills spring up, new spindles and looms are put in motion by thousands, the latest mechanical and labour-saving appliances are brought into requisition, all with the view of increasing the output of rival companies or firms. Meanwhile population goes steadily on increasing in a kind of geometrical progression, but not fast enough to consume all the goods which are, to say nothing of all that could be, manufactured. The checks to population, suggested by many economical writers, would not help us in this case, as they would have the effect of diminishing consumption, while the powers of production would continue to increase.

§ 43. Several causes have been at work in recent years, all tending to hinder the progress of British trade, some only temporarily, but others have been more or less permanent in their effects. Many of these causes lie beyond the scope of this inquiry, which is restricted chiefly to the action of workmen, either singly or combined; others incidentally affect that action, but whether it is the workmen or the employers who are to blame, is quite another question. For example, the shipment of shoddy goods to our colonies, and of similar consignments to foreign markets, may have stimulated both colonists and foreigners to become our rivals. Merchants and shippers have acted as though they thought that anything was good enough for exportation. Goods have been, and often are, made specially for export, and in many instances they have been so scandalously bad that they have been thrown upon the hands of the manufacturer or shipper. Is it reasonable to suppose that purchasers would continue to be taken in by the rascally stuff palmed off upon them? In many instances these goods were sent to countries in which the mass of the population had a technical training

superior to that of British workmen; would these people be content to be supplied with inferior articles when they could remedy it by home production? Is it indeed surprising that attempts are made to supplant us by their own manufactures? The natural instinct of self-preservation would urge them to take such a step, and the dislike of being victimised by a foreigner would encourage efforts to supply their own markets by the productions of their own handicraftsmen. Besides which, England is not alone in having to solve the social problem; the question of finding employment and feeding the people is a source of anxiety in foreign countries quite as much as it is at home.

§ 44. Among the causes mentioned at the date of the first publication of this work as operating most disastrously for the trade and commerce of this country, was the critical state of affairs in Europe, as having unsettled the public mind, conduced to uncertainty among speculators and purchasers of English goods, and produced fluctuations in the market. At that time the full force of the industrial disturbance had not been felt, but it had already, and still was, deranging financial and commercial operations to an extent which led to the conviction that much of the outcry raised against British workmen was in reality due to foreign complications in Eastern affairs, to the action of Turkey as regards her financial obligations, and to the disquietude in Europe caused by "the friends of order" in France, who were then attempting to destroy liberty, and plant a despotism in its stead. The investigations by the Select Committee into "foreign loans," and the exposures of frauds and embezzlements in connection therewith, and also the trickery, misrepresentations, and frauds of company-mongers and brokers, brought to light by the London Stock Exchange Commission, and many other things equally discreditable, all conspired to produce a want of confidence, just at the time when the slightest disaffection, whether at home or abroad, tended to disturb the money market and influence the course of trade. After reviewing all these facts and circumstances, it was predicted that, by the restoration of peace and of public confidence, a revival of trade might be confidently looked forward to, such as would possibly satisfy the alarmists and croakers who then prognosticated our utter ruin.

The prediction has been fulfilled, even to the extent of silencing those who prophesied evil, and that continually, as regards the industrial position of England among the nations.

§ 45. (*d*) In what way, and to what extent, have English workmen contributed to the alleged decline of British trade? They are accused of having done so in two ways: (1) By the exaction of higher wages than manufacturers can afford to pay; by limiting the number of apprentices; by the limitation of production; and by shorter hours of labour; and (2) by the bad and inferior character of their workmanship. These several matters have been mostly dealt with, more or less in detail, in various parts of this work. It has been shown, for example, that the alleged limitations and restrictions in respect of apprentices are altogether insufficient to affect, in any material degree, the utmost freedom of trade, or interfere with the training, lax as it is, of a sufficient number of boys to supply the places of those who die annually or leave the trade, and to keep pace with the requirements of the various industries in which they are respectively needed. Moreover, it is a notable fact that there are no apprenticeships worth mentioning in the particular branches of trade where it is said that these restrictive regulations operate to the disadvantage of British commerce. With the exception of the engineering trades, and of boiler-making and iron-shipbuilding, there is no system of apprenticeships in the iron and steel trades of the country which could possibly interfere with British manufacturing production; and even in the two trades above specified, the limitations are not such as to positively injure employers of labour, or affect injuriously the course of trade. In the textile trades—cottons, woollens, silks, lace, hosiery, or in the leather trades, and others in which we do any considerable export trade, no system of apprenticeships exists which could, even by a stretch of imagination, really produce any of the evils attributed to trade unions in these respects. If any argument at all can be founded upon the apprenticeship system, as regards foreign competition, it is that we have suffered from a lack of skill and taste by the abolition of the system, and by not finding a substitute therefor.

§ 46. The allegation that a limitation of production has

operated disastrously, is equally without foundation. This is one of the periodical or occasional cries which is heard in connection with foreign competition; of late it has been infrequent, but only last year the cry was revived in connection with the output of coal, of iron and steel, and in connection with iron-shipbuilding. As a rule, production, or output, is regulated by employers, not by workmen; in exceptional cases the men have tried to check the output, but usually the attempt has had reference to wages, or other conditions of labour. Certainly the output of coal has gone on increasing, and the output of iron and steel has recently been such as to produce a glut, with the result that furnaces have been damped down, mills have been running short time, and overtime has been checked, because production was ahead of consumption. This accusation has no more foundation in fact than the previous one, in so far as trade unions are concerned. As regards the miner, the output per man has increased on the average very considerably since 1873. In that year the output per miner employed was 235 tons; in the next five years, 1875–79, the average was 270 tons; in the succeeding five years, 1880–84, the average was 310 tons; in the last four years the average has been less, probably about 305 tons per man. But the output is not of itself a perfect test, as every circumstance affecting the output, and the working would have to be taken into account. Speaking generally, the output per person employed has increased of late years, due to a variety of causes, such as improved machinery, and appliances of all kinds, and other conditions of employment. If we regard the total output as of consequence in connection with the ratio of production, we find that the averages show a considerable progressive development. The average annual production of coal in the ten years, 1851–60, was 64,868,575 tons; in the ten years, 1861–70, the annual average was 97,001,388 tons; in the ten years, 1871–80, the annual average was 131,403,306 tons; in the five years, 1881–85, the average was, 158,904,960 tons; and in the last four years, 1886–89, the average was 166,622,559 tons. If we compare the total output of the United Kingdom, with the output of the coal-producing countries, we find no absolute cause for alarm. Our exports have increased from 129,680,131 tons

in 1873, to 176,916,724 tons in 1889, an increase of 48,234,593 tons. Austria has increased her output by about 2 millions, Belgium by about 3 millions, France by about 4 millions, Germany by about 30 millions, Russia by about 3 millions; total, about 42 millions of tons. America has, however, more than doubled her output, the increase being about 65 million tons. In this case there has been an enormous development of coal-mining in the United States.

§ 47. The question of shorter hours has been discussed elsewhere.* In so far as it pertains to foreign competition, it is similar to that of limitation of production, already dealt with, or it affects the cost of production, which is quite another matter. The capacity of production, and the total output, have been shown to be in excess of the means of consumption, the stocks on hand in various manufacturing industries is a complete answer therefore to the allegation that limited production has caused the decline of British trade. The question is thus narrowed to wages and workmanship. Lord Brassey has shown, in numerous writings and addresses, that high wages do not necessarily mean costly production. If the rates of wages are higher, English workmen produce more in a given time than foreign workmen, and they require less supervision. Their application is closer, more continuous and constant, than any other class of workers in any part of the world. And generally it is conceded that the quality of their work is more durable and reliable than that of foreign workmen. This is not said in disparagement of foreigners, as many circumstances and national characteristics have led to the difference, whatever might be its extent. Elaborate comparisons have been instituted by experts and employers as to the capacity of production, and the actual average output per person employed, in the iron and coal trades, the textile industries, excavation, and numerous other occupations, with the result, always the same, that the cost of production in British manufactures is less than in any country in the world; and the proportionate cost is rather diminishing in Great Britain than increasing, and will continue to diminish as foreign workmen improve their position.

* See Chapter VI., Part II., Hours of Labour.

§ 48. The fact seems to be forgotten that the wages of foreign workmen have advanced considerably during the last twenty-five years, and more particularly during the last twenty years. *The Times*, on October 26th, 1877, instituted a comparison between the wages, cost of living, etc., at that date and ten years previously. It was shown in that carefully written and valuable article that the wages of those engaged in the iron trades of Germany had advanced from 60 to 100 per cent. in less than ten years; of masons, 50 per cent., and the latter did less work by one-half than formerly. It was asserted the difference in rents amounted to 50 per cent., as compared with London, the increase being attributed to the superior skill and greater efficiency of English labour. In the same article a comparison was drawn between the factory workers of Saxony and England, with this result, that a thousand spindles were worked in England with 3·1 employés, whereas in Saxony it required 5·99, or nearly double. Thus: if two factories were of the same size, each containing 64,000 spindles, the wages in the German concern would amount to £12,000 annually, and in the English concern to £8,800, or a saving in the labour cost of production alone of £3,200 a year, although the English operative's wages averaged 16*s.* 10*d.* per week, while the Saxon was only paid 11*s.* 10*d.*, for which he worked longer hours. "Cotton spinning in Saxony is fast becoming an extinct trade," the writer remarked, and recent figures show that the value of cotton yarn exported from Germany in 1878 was 30 million marks, and in 1887 it amounted to only 17½ million marks; but other cotton manufactures have increased in value. In France and Belgium wages have also increased, and are increasing, so the wages question is not of such supreme importance as some would have us believe. Recent industrial movements on the Continent will help to equalise wages more and more, up to a higher level.

§ 49. In estimating the growth of British trade, many persons look almost wholly to the Board of Trade Returns relating to imports and exports, and more particularly the latter. Solomon has said that a fool's eyes are in the ends of the earth; without desiring to apply the term to our alarmists, they also

look to the ends of the earth for the test of British prosperity, when evidence enough can be found at their very doors to satisfy them that an enormous expansion is taking place in our own country, in nearly all branches of industry. The internal wealth resources of Great Britain have been developed to an extent which staggers the statistician, but which is regarded by the self-complacent average Englishman as merely our normal growth. If it be the normal growth, then, instead of grumbling, the participator in this augmented wealth should thank Heaven that his lot has fallen in pleasant places, even in the land of Goshen. It had become quite the fashion some years ago to estimate the extent of British wealth, to take stock as it were of our national resources. John Bull had somehow come to the conclusion that, what with strikes, limitation of production, high wages, short hours of labour, general deterioration in workmanship, and the disposition to do as little work as possible for the wages demanded, the sun of England had passed its meridian, that it was declining towards the west, and that there was no kind of mistake about its setting, the only question was—how soon. Forthwith accountants were called in, of the very highest character for ability and honesty, to take stock, and make out a clean balance-sheet of profits and loss, of assets and liabilities, for the firm trading under the name of John Bull & Co. could not bear the thought of possible insolvency. The creditors must therefore be taken into confidence; the books must be overhauled, and the firm must be cleared of even suspicion.

§ 50. The statisticians set to work, and they produced such a mass of statistics as to be absolutely overwhelming, all tending to show that the firm was not only solvent, capable of paying twenty silver shillings for every golden sovereign, but that its accumulations had been going on for years past on a scale which was marvellous, and even astounding. From the piles of figures amassed at that time we learn that, from 1861 to 1875, the annual value of land had increased from £60,305,285 to £66,911,463; houses, from £61,924,178 to £94,637,576; mines, from £4,436,110 to £14,107,990; ironworks, from £1,079,589 to £7,260,802; railways, from £14,814,149 to £27,545,103;

canals, gasworks, quarries, and other profits, from £5,141,463 to £8,354,913. The total annual value of property and profits assessed had thus risen from £335,654,211 in 1861, to £571,056,167 in 1875, or a total annual increase of £235,401,956, as the growth of home investments alone in fifteen years. The remark was added that "there is ample scope for still further development within the area of the United Kingdom; if the rate of interest is not quite so large, the security is greater, and consequently as permanent investments home securities offer advantages not always to be found elsewhere." In addition to the foregoing, Professor Leone Levi had estimated that British capital to the amount of over £300,000,000 was invested in foreign loans of one kind and another up to that time.

§ 51. In a paper read before the Statistical Society, on January 15th, 1878, Mr. Robert Giffen estimated that the total capital of the country in 1875, amounted to the stupendous sum of £8,548,120,000, in comparison to which the National Debt was a mere fleabite. Dealing with the accumulations of capital, he stated "that the gross income assessed in Great Britain rose from 115 millions at the beginning of the century, to 130 millions in 1815, to 251 millions in 1843, and to 262 millions in 1853; and then, in the United Kingdom, from 308 millions in 1855, to 396 millions in 1865, and then to 571 millions in 1875. The total increase in the income assessed, between 1865 and 1875, amounted to 175 millions, which is equal to 44 per cent. in ten years." The writer continued: "If the capital of that portion of the income derived from capital has only progressed at the same rate, the annual increase of capital all through, and especially of recent years, must have been enormous." "Leaving out altogether the capital not yielding income, and dealing only with the capital yielding income, a similar increase of capital . . . would give us, for 1865, a total capital of about 5,200 millions, on which the increase at 44 per cent., would be 2,288 millions, or in round figures 230 millions per annum." After stating further details of his estimate, he continued: "The national estate has thus improved in the ten years at the rate of 240 millions per annum." This increase had exceeded the

proportionate increase of population by 1,800 millions, or two and a half times the total amount of the National Debt, the whole of which the nation might spend and still be as rich individually and collectively as we were ten years previously.

§ 52. Fortunately the same able and indefatigable statistician has enabled us to test our national progress for yet another ten years—from 1875 to 1885. On December 17th, 1889, Mr. Robert Giffen read a paper before the Royal Statistical Society, on Accumulations of Capital in the United Kingdom in 1875–85, in continuation of his paper in 1878, above quoted. The ten years covered by the writer included the long period of depression in trade to 1880, of which we have heard so much, and which was so acute as to lead to the appointment of Royal Commissions on Depression in Trade, on Agriculture, and on the Currency, and also several Select Committees to inquire into these and cognate subjects. Taking precisely the same items as in 1875, under the same heads, and upon the same basis of comparison, Mr. Giffen estimates that the total national income has increased from 484,586 millions sterling in 1875, to 554,022 millions in 1885, an increase of 69,536 millions; and that the total capital has increased from 8,548,120 millions sterling in 1875, to 10,037,436 in 1885, or an increase of 1,489,316 millions in ten years, or about 17½ per cent. In estimating, Mr. Giffen allows for depreciation under several heads, as a consequence of depression in trade, in some of which cases there has been a notable recovery within the last two or three years. For example, in land, Mr. Giffen capitalised the lands in Ireland at fifteen years' purchase, whereas the Land Purchase scheme of the Government bases its estimate on twenty years' purchase. If the ratio of accumulation is not so great as in the previous decade, the aggregate is enormous, even on the reduced estimate of Mr. Giffen, namely an increase in national income of 69,536 millions yearly, and of capital 1,489,316,000 in ten years.

§ 53. The obvious conclusion from the foregoing facts and figures is that our national industries are not going to decay, as some alarmists had predicted; and that our national wealth is accumulating, if not at an accelerated speed, yet in such magnitude as to be only described by the term stupendous. One other

fact is conclusive—the Chancellor of the Exchequer has recently been able to convert the National Debt without even a hitch in the negotiations, or in the manipulation, showing that capital has accumulated in such proportions that an outlet for it is not easily obtainable in the ordinary commercial channels, whether at home or abroad, or both at home and abroad. A careful review of all the facts, taking into consideration all the circumstances connected with Capital and Labour, intensifies the conviction that whatever may be the faults of the British workman, he is not chargeable with having ruined British commerce, with driving away the trade of the country, and with having made it impossible to compete with the foreigner, as has been alleged. The chances indeed are that foreign workmen will claim higher rates of wages, demand shorter hours of labour, and insist upon better conditions of employment, and thus help to equalise the bases of competition in all parts of the world. At home, employers are beginning to recognise the impolicy of competing on the basis of low wages and long hours. On such a basis honourable and humane employers are placed at a disadvantage, whilst sweaters, shoddy manufacturers, and slop workers flourish by "grinding the faces of the poor." Trade unions, properly conducted, will be conducive to better workmanship, to healtheir forms of competition, and to a higher standard of living; they will not destroy, but advance industry to its rightful place in the social economy of civilised nations.

CHAPTER X.

LABOUR IN COALITION.

I. THE FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS. II. TRADES' COUNCILS. III. TRADES UNION CONGRESSES.

I.—FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. The general public feel a kind of undefined dread, lest the whole of the trade unions of the country should resolve to federate themselves into one vast organisation, constituted on a permanent basis, with the object of effecting an alliance for offensive as well as defensive purposes, and of amalgamating their funds, so as to make them available for every possible emergency, in case of labour disputes.

§ 2. This "undefined dread" operates with far greater force upon the minds of those who constitute the outside public, than it does upon the minds of employers; although even the latter are sometimes seized with a vague fear, almost amounting to a panic, which in effect seems to imply that in the future, and possibly at no far distant date, they will have to deal, not merely with the individual unions, representing the separate and distinct trades, but with a powerful confederation embracing every trade in the United Kingdom.

§ 3. It was this hazy dream of "social democrats" which, so it was alleged, led the employers in 1873 to form "The Federation of Associated Employers of Labour." In their "statement, as to formation and objects," they say that "it has been formed in consequence of the extraordinary development, oppressive action, far-reaching but openly avowed designs, and

elaborate organisation of trade unions." The reason given by the masters for creating this vast organisation, with its elaborate machinery, and its own special organ, called *Capital and Labour*, was no doubt, in so far as it appeared to them, honest and fair; but in reality it was chiefly due to a panic which had led them to exaggerate the dangers, real and supposed, arising from the existence of trade unions, and the influence exercised by them in labour disputes, whose action, as they conceived, was both violent and aggressive. There was also a mistaken notion as to the objects and aims of such unions, to whose evil influence they attributed all the disasters which from time to time arise in connection with labour and capital, and especially the frequent antagonism of those two social forces.

§ 4. The project with regard to the federation of trade unions is by no means a new one. In the past history of labour it has often been dimly shadowed forth, and on more than one occasion it has been broached in a definite form, and has even taken a tangible shape, but it has never yet assumed formidable proportions, or taken such deep root as to render it dangerous to capital, or to occasion real anxiety in the public mind.

§ 5. The first great and methodical attempt at such a federation of labour was the National Association of Organised Trades, which was inaugurated on March 25, 1846. This association was very active during the two first years of its existence, but for many years previous to its final dissolution in 1861 its efforts were chiefly directed towards the establishment of Courts of Conciliation and Boards of Arbitration for the purpose of dealing more effectually with trade disputes. The Bills introduced into parliament by Lord St. Leonards were chiefly due to the efforts of that body, supplemented in later years by the action of the London Trades' Council, and the personal efforts of some few of the leading members of the metropolitan trades. The final shape and form of the Bill, introduced by Lord St. Leonards, was the result of an interview which took place at Boyle Farm, in 1867, between the noble lord and two representatives from the London trades, and the secretary of the National Association, and especially the portion of the Bill

which related to the constitution of the courts, to whom the several questions in dispute were to be submitted.*

§ 6. In 1865 another attempt was made to effect a federation of the trade unions of the whole country, into one vast organisation, by the inauguration at Sheffield of the "United Kingdom Alliance of Organised Trades," whose object, like its predecessor, was to unite the several unions of the country into one compact and powerful body. At its first conference, held in Sheffield in 1865, a scheme was submitted in furtherance of this object; several proposals were laid before the meeting, and discussed, with a view to promote such an alliance of the trades as would in the future produce something like harmony of action between the members of the several unions, and in effect create a central fund with which to "resist the aggressions of the masters," and aid those who were engaged in a strike, or who were "the victims of a lock-out, on the part of the masters." But a dark cloud began at this time to throw its shadows over the very town which was anxious to take the lead in this ambitious project; "rumours were in the air," having reference to heinous crimes, hitherto concealed from public view, which had baffled the police and courts of law, and pointing unmistakably to the principal offenders. The secrets of this terrible system of outrage could no longer be hidden, and very soon the cloud burst, and revealed both the crimes and the criminals. The new association struggled on, however, for some time, and in 1866 held another conference in Manchester; this was succeeded by one held in Preston in September, 1867. At this date 47 trades belonged to the association, representing about 23,000 members. It was at this time in debt, and a levy of *one penny* per member, per week, was resolved upon to meet the *then* liabilities of the Alliance. Meanwhile the official inquiry at Sheffield had brought to light a series of crimes which sent a thrill of horror through all classes of society. The result was that the scheme failed from lack of members and funds; some of those who had joined broke away, others were

* The interview took place at Lord St. Leonards' request. The late Mr. George Odger, Mr. Thomas Winter, and the present writer formed the deputation.

at the time so distressed, in consequence of depression in trade, that they were unable to pay their levies; after a struggling existence of about two years, finding that it was not able to proceed with its work, the association came to grief, and was dissolved. In point of fact, the whole scheme was abortive; its plans broke down, its treasury was insolvent, and all the efforts of the Sheffielders could not give it stability or life. From first to last about 60,000 members joined the association, and it raised, by way of levy and contribution, about £2,000. It is but fair to say that most of the leading men of Sheffield, who were prominent as members of this association, were in no way implicated in the outrages, although the principal offender held the position of treasurer, until the date of his examination. The above-mentioned association must not be confounded with that of the Organised Trades of Sheffield, which, although similar in name, was purely local, being a Trades' Council, confined to the town and its neighbourhood.

§ 7. Another effort was made to collect and concentrate the whole of the forces of trade unions into one focus, and to centralise its power, by the London Working Men's Association; but, beyond its first conference, held in London in March, 1867, it did little in the way of general organisation. Whatever other work it engaged in was chiefly confined to efforts to amend the law of master and servant, and to promote political agitation. In reality it never seriously proposed to weld the trade unions of the country into one vast association; and if it had so proposed, it was powerless to effect the object.

§ 8. The idea of starting a national federation of trades slumbered after this, until January, 1873, when the subject was brought before the Trades Union Congress, then being held in Leeds, by the secretary of the Sheffield Trades' Council. In January of the following year, 1874, at the Congress held in Sheffield, the subject was again brought forward and discussed, but there was considerable diversity of opinion, as to the practicability of effecting any federation which would be useful, or command general support. In the end the subject was referred to the Parliamentary Committee. At the Liverpool Congress, held in 1875, a special meeting of the chief representatives took

place for the purpose of discussing the whole question, and of formulating a basis of federation, to be submitted to the trades. After a good deal of discussion, in which great diversity of opinion was manifested, a basis was agreed upon, and a code of rules was framed to be laid before the organised trades of the country. The draft code was sent to the various societies, who were requested to send delegates to a further conference to be held in Glasgow in October of the same year, 1875. At that conference the draft rules were again discussed, and adopted; they were again submitted to the various societies, who were asked to send representatives to another conference, to be held in Birmingham in May, 1876. Only four societies responded; the delegates therefore gave up the attempt to start a Federation. At the Edinburgh Congress, in 1879, the idea was revived, the object being to institute a fund for the maintenance of the "nine hours' system." This proposal was again submitted to the trades; but "so poor was the response," that the Parliamentary Committee reported to the next Congress, held in Dublin in 1880, their inability to form any opinion on the subject. Attempts were subsequently made to reopen the subject at several succeeding Congresses, but without any degree of success, no actual steps being taken down to and including the Congress held at Bradford in 1888.

§ 9. There was considerable discussion at the time, more especially in the public press, with regard to these abortive attempts at federation. The employers declared that if some such confederation were ever effected, the ruin of the trade of the country would be complete and irretrievable. But this prophecy has been made so often that, like the boy in the fable of the wolf and the sheep, people begin to discredit the cry; and even if the predicted mischief were to arise, the Cassandras would be disbelieved, so that the fold would be ravaged before help could arrive to prevent the disaster. There is, however, very little danger to be apprehended, by employers or the public, from this cause; if any such federation should ever be brought about, it will be due to some concerted and arbitrary action on the part of employers, which will have the effect of forcing a precipitate and concurrent movement on the part of

the trades. If measures were ever taken with the object of putting down combinations of the men, combined action would at once be taken to resist such a mad-headed piece of folly. Until that day arrives, the employers and the public may rest assured that the trade of England is safe, in so far as it depends on a confederation of the whole of the trade unions into one vast army for defence or aggression; there are too many difficulties in the way, which cannot be overcome either easily or quickly.

§ 10. There is certainly a bare possibility of partial federation amongst cognate trades, such as the engineers, the steam-engine makers, the ironfounders, the boiler-makers, and iron shipbuilders; or in the building trades, comprising the carpenters and joiners, the masons, the bricklayers, the plasterers, and others; or, again, in the textile trades, embracing the spinners and weavers in silks, cottons, woollens, and many other branches. But the probability, even of this, is not so great as may be supposed, for there are very many distinct and separate interests to be considered, and reconciled, before any action could be taken, which would be likely to have any practical results, or any direct bearing on labour questions.

§ 11. The difficulties in the way of federation are much greater than most persons imagine; if we take the building trades, as an example, there are three large unions of the carpenters and joiners, two in England, and one in Scotland, besides local unions; these cannot, or will not amalgamate; there are two of the masons, one in England, and one in Scotland; there are two of the bricklayers, which for years have been at variance, and will not co-operate. The engineers and the steam-engine makers are separate and distinct, and so are the ironfounders of England and Scotland. There is little prospect of this dream of federation being realised; and if ever there should be a kind of loose confederation, as the result of circumstances which cannot now be foreseen, it will be formed for defensive purposes only.

§ 12. English capitalists may therefore feel secure, in so far as they are threatened with ruin from this cause; the idea is but a phantom and a dream, terrible in its realism to timid and

superstitious people, but dismissed with a smile by those who know anything of the habits and modes of thought of the working classes of this country, and especially of unionists, who are neither dreamers nor Socialists, but slow, practical, hard-headed Anglo-Saxons, to whom an extra penny per hour is of more value than the finest theory ever propounded by patriot or philosopher. The danger rather is that they take too little heed of the warnings and teachings of patriots and philosophers, than that they are likely to be led astray by their socialistic doctrines.

§ 13. Employers have often tried to effect a Federation, sometimes on a large scale, but, as a rule, they have not been more successful than the workmen. The most ambitious attempt was made in 1873, when the "National Federation of Associated Employers" was instituted, at Manchester, by Mr. E. Raynsford Jackson, Mr. John Robinson, Mr. Stephen A. Marshall, and Mr. Henry Whitworth. This Federation established a newspaper, called *Capital and Labour*, with Dr. Aubrey as editor. The Association and its organ continued in existence for some years, mainly to oppose the legislation inaugurated by the Trades Union Congress, but it utterly failed, and the Federation was ultimately dissolved, the newspaper finally collapsing. This Federation was conducted with great ability, and had great resources at command, and for a time the newspaper press was full of its doings, and of its proposals. Why, then, did it fail? For the simple reason that employers, like workmen, have separate and distinct interests, those being the strongest which pertain to the particular trade in which they are engaged, and in which their capital is invested. These they cannot, or will not, merge into a common cause, any more than trade unions. A great engineering firm cannot be expected to attach itself to a firm of wholesale clothiers, any more than the Amalgamated Society of Engineers could sink all distinctions and become a constituent part of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors. Either might combine for temporary purposes; but to become an integral part of one Federation is quite out of the question, both with employers and with workmen.

§ 14. Employers have been and are often associated together for mutual protection, in particular groups of industries, as for

example in the Building trades, in the Coal trades, in the Iron trades, and in the Cotton trades. The Engineering trades have had some kind of general Association for many years. Last year a more ambitious project was set on foot, namely, a National Federation of the Shipbuilders and Engineers of the United Kingdom. The institution of this "National Federation" at once led to proposals to federate the different sections of the workmen employed in those industries. As these two Federations are the most important now in existence, a summary of their objects will be useful, whatever their ultimate fate may be. The objects of the "National Federation of Shipbuilders and Engineers," as set forth in their rules, are: "(1) To watch over Bills brought into parliament affecting the general interests of Shipbuilders and Engineers. (2) Generally to protect such interests. (3) Mutual support in resisting interference by workmen's associations with free contract work, number of apprentices engaged, etc. (4) To support any association, or combination of firms, or a distinct or single firm, in bringing any unreasonable strike to end by not employing, or by the adoption of any other means decided on. (5) To arrange for alterations of wages in all districts taking place for stated periods, and at fixed dates. (6) To prevent men—by the systematic use of Inquiry Forms—from deserting their work and obtaining employment under assumed names." The scope of this Federation is, to say the least of it, as open to objection as any federation of workmen can possibly be. Its methods, let us hope, will be less objectionable.

§ 15. The publication of those objects immediately led to steps being taken to convene a conference of the several unions representing the different branches of trade, affected by the new Association. The conference was held at Manchester on February 13th, 1890, when the basis of a Federation was drawn up and unanimously adopted, to be submitted to the different societies for approval. The representatives at that conference urged the necessity for federation, as future contests with the great National Union of Employers would be national, not local, and the only way in which to meet the employers on equal terms would be a large Federation. The conference decided to

limit the scope of the proposed Federation to societies already fairly well organised, to unions which can help, and not be a source of weakness. The circular says: "We do not want a Federation to which we shall run for assistance in every little contest; but one composed of organisations capable of coping single-handed with any ordinary difficulty." It points to the fact that the formation of the Employers' Federation has called this into existence, and that the power and influence of the Workmen's Federation will enable the unions to settle their differences without strikes. The circular distinctly states that "the object is not of an aggressive nature, but for defensive purposes and the protection of rights already acquired." It adds: "We shall never resort to a strike until we have exhausted every means in our power to settle our differences by conciliation."

§ 16. The policy of the Federation is set forth in a series of propositions, which constitute the basis of the Workmen's Federation. Briefly they are as follows: (1) In the event of a dispute between any society in the Federation and their employers, the other societies are not to interfere unless non-society men are brought in to take the place of those on strike, or other unfair means are used to crush the society affected. If this occurs, a conference is to be called to take what action may be necessary, on the request of the executive of the society involved in the dispute. (2) No member of any society in the Federation is to do any work during a strike in substitution for the men on strike. (3) If a dispute between the societies in federation takes place, and is not amicably settled, such dispute is to be referred to a Court of Arbitration, selected by the parties affected, each party to appoint one or two Arbitrators, who shall appoint an Umpire, whose decision shall be final and binding, all of whom must be trade unionists. Each party to pay moiety of the expenses. The Court of Arbitration thus formed to decide methods of procedure, place of meeting, and as to costs. (4) The Federation to be of a mutual character, no financial responsibilities to attach to any society composing it, other than the claims of its own members, and expenses of working the Federation. (5) Any society may withdraw from the Federation upon giving six months' notice in writing to the secretary.

The first object of the Federation is to be to obtain abolition of the systematic use of the "Character Note," or so to modify the same as to deprive it of its injurious effects to the workmen. Practically the intention of this "Character Note" is to prevent men from belonging to a trade union, while employers condemn compulsion to belong to a trade union.

§ 17. The societies affiliated to the Federation include the Amalgamated Society of Engineers; the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders; the Steam-engine Makers; the Ironfounders; the Associated Blacksmiths; the Co-operative Smiths; the Associated Shipwrights; the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners, and the General Union of Joiners. The two last-named societies would appear to make the Federation somewhat broader than that of the employers; but joiners are much employed in connection with the previously named seven trades, besides which the basis of their organisation is similar in the most essential respects. It will be seen that this Federation has in it none of the much dreaded elements of centralisation. It has no powers of initiative; it cannot promote, but it may prevent strikes. It is purely defensive, and its action will entirely depend upon the proceedings of the Employers' Federation.

§ 18. The Mine-owners have also a "National Federation," as was seen in the recent dispute among the miners; and opposed to this the miners instituted a "National Federation" in 1889. The latter does not include Durham and Northumberland, but nearly all the other mining counties belong to it. This Federation is based upon similar principles to that before mentioned. It has no central funds, does not interfere with the policy of the several unions composing it, and only acts as the exponent of the whole body in cases of a common object, and common cause, agreed upon by the delegates and agents in council assembled.

§ 19. The question of a National Federation of all trades was again before the Trades Union Congress, at Dundee, in September, 1889, when a resolution was unanimously adopted requesting the Parliamentary Committee to draw up some system of federation for the consideration of the next Congress. It was

explained that the subject had been mooted at several Congresses since 1875, when the question was considered by the chief representatives at Liverpool, at a meeting outside the proceedings of the Congress proper, by whom a scheme was framed, and sent round to the societies represented.* The object which some of the delegates have in view is a National Federation of all trades, a scheme which has not hitherto found favour with the older and more experienced officers and leaders of the chief unions. They are impressed by the enormous difficulties inseparable from any such scheme, both as respects matters of policy, and of administration. The leaders of the newer unions, recently established, especially those called into existence in connection with "unskilled labour," have a notion that nothing will solve the labour problem, or obtain for labour its rightful dues, except a National Federation of all the trades in the country. The Socialists go further, and declare that the solidarity of labour, by international confederation, is essential to the emancipation of labour. The object may be good, but the policy, as set forth by its advocates, is extremely doubtful. That a closer union of the workmen of all countries will be conducive to the advancement of labour, cannot be gainsaid; but everything depends upon the objects, and the means employed. The recent International Labour Congresses and Conferences will assist in developing a *modus vivendi*, and the *modus operandi* for such co-operation as may be mutually beneficial to the workmen of all countries.

II.—TRADES' COUNCILS.

§ 20. Trades' Councils are considered by many merely as a preliminary step towards a complete federation of the unions; to a certain extent they may have that appearance to those who

* The scheme prepared by the delegates at Liverpool in 1875, was re-issued by the Parliamentary Committee in March, 1890, with slight modifications. The revised scheme will be considered at the next Liverpool Congress, in September, 1890. The proposals involve a Federation in the strict sense of the term, with a central fund, and an executive government. Its adoption is, however, somewhat doubtful.

only know them by hearsay. If, however, they have this tendency at all, it is only in the mildest possible form, and need create no uneasiness in the public mind. As at present constituted they carry comparatively little weight, and exert even less influence upon the general body of the unions, in their individual or corporate capacity; at least it is so as regards their internal arrangements, or their decisions in all matters of policy or government. As a matter of fact it was never intended that a Trades' Council should meddle with, or interfere in, the working of any of the societies of which it is composed, and in most of their rules there is a positive prohibition against any such interference.

§ 21. The special object of a trades' council seems to be to act as a medium of intercommunication between the several local trades of the town which have affiliated themselves to that body; and also as a means of ready and concerted action in matters of general interest, but which are not quite within the sphere of any one union in the town or district to initiate. Sometimes, at the solicitation of a trade, they go considerably beyond the narrow scope of their own rules, but when they do so they act with great caution.

§ 22. The constitution of trades' councils, and their objects, are pretty much the same in all places; a general description will therefore be sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes, as it will apply equally to each and every one of them. (1) They are essentially voluntary in their character and organisation; any union in the district may or may not join the council, as it thinks fit, or it may cease its connection with it at any moment, if it desires to do so. (2) The payments are also voluntary, although active efforts are usually made to approximate, as nearly as possible, to a *pro rata* contribution, according to the number of members represented, but this is not always absolutely and strictly enforced. (3) In most cases the annual payments are ridiculously small, not amounting very often to more than *one farthing* or halfpenny per member per year. From time to time strenuous exertions have been made for the purpose of inducing the several unions to agree to an annual payment of one penny per member, but hitherto this has not been uniformly

successful. The payment to the London Trades' Council stands at present at twopence per member per year, but this has only been adopted of late years, and even yet some unions have not agreed to the amount and are not affiliated. The most ambitious proposal yet made has not exceeded one shilling per annum, and even this modest sum must be regarded for some years as unattainable, except in isolated cases. As a kind of *ultima thule* some few enthusiasts have suggested a levy of a penny per week per member, as a thing to be desired, to be debated, and even worked for, but it is a dream of the future which may never be realised.

§ 23. In some of the larger unions the local branches are not allowed to vote money from the society's funds towards the expenses of the district trades' council; if they wish to join they can only do so by means of a local levy, unless they have a local fund available. The members are usually much opposed to local levies, except for the special purposes of their own union, and even then they are not often popular. In places where the executive council, or central committee, of a general union is located, that is, where for the time being the seat of government is situate, they usually join the trades' council, if there happens to be one; but this is not always the case, for they not unfrequently regard it as a delegation of their authority to an outside body, there being at all times considerable jealousy of everything which has the appearance of extraneous interference.

§ 24. The societies which join or affiliate themselves to a trades' council send delegates or representatives; these form the general council or body of delegates from which are elected, annually, the executive whose duty it is to transact all the ordinary business which from time to time is brought before it. If matters of great importance should arise, a delegate meeting of the whole body is called, consisting of representatives from the several unions belonging to the general council, to whom the matter is then referred, and with whom rests the final decision. There is a wise elasticity in the rules of most of these councils, which enables them, if the matter is of supreme importance, to disregard the mere technical right of being represented at such meeting, and to include in the invitation not only

those specially delegated by contributing societies, but those also who have not yet affiliated themselves to the council, and even many private persons, who take an interest in the particular or general question, are sometimes invited. The value of this elasticity has been apparent more than once, when, for instance, it has been thought desirable to have the united expression of opinion of the whole of the organised bodies in the district, regardless of the mere technical right of being present by deputy. In such cases there is no restriction, either as to speaking or voting, each having an equal voice and vote.

§ 25. The functions of a trades' council are various; the scope of its work depends on the character of its members, on the locality, and on surrounding circumstances. One of the most useful to trade societies is its power and authority to collect funds, in case of a lock-out or strike, from the several unions in the district, or elsewhere, in aid of those who are engaged in the contest. The assistance thus rendered is usually supplementary to the pay accorded by the society to its members on strike. In some cases additional support has been considerable. During the year 1872, the London Trades' Council collected, or promoted the collection of, £745 5*s.* 1*d.*; and again, in 1873 and 1874, collected £2,733 19*s.* 10½*d.*, in aid of the Agricultural Labourers; this was supplemented by £79 17*s.* 9½*d.* after the lock-out had closed. In other towns large amounts have, from time to time, been collected in aid of miners, iron-workers, agricultural labourers, and many other bodies, when in distress or on strike, by the various trades' councils of the kingdom.

§ 26. Another useful purpose which trades' councils have served, has been the investigation of the causes and circumstances of a dispute, so as to report to the several trades whether the parties applying for their help deserved to be assisted, and, if so, to give them credentials, as an introduction to the executive councils or committees of the unions, with a recommendation to them to give what help they could afford. This practice has had the effect, more than once, of assisting to close the dispute, when it was found that the demands of the men were excessive, or that the grounds of the dispute were untenable. Often and

often have the delegates been sent back to their unions, by a trades' council, with the wholesome, although not always palatable, advice, "Close the strike on the best terms you can, for we cannot recommend the trades to aid you under the circumstances." In cases like these the trades' council considers itself as the guardian of the purse of the unions, the strings of which must not be opened, unless good and substantial reasons can be given for so doing.

§ 27. They are also useful very often in cases of dispute between one union and another. Trade unions are not such perfect doves, as to be always in harmony with each other. Sometimes their feuds are very bitter, and of long standing; it is then that a trades' council can step in and arbitrate between the two contending parties. They may not always be successful in effecting a settlement, but they nevertheless pave the way for a better understanding in the future. Many cases have occurred in which their efforts have been most useful in preventing a union from incurring the odium of a strike, through some misunderstanding, or petty jealousy, between two sections of one trade, which, in the end, had it taken place, would not only have injured both parties to the dispute, but would also have been ruinous to the employer, although he was in no way concerned in the cause of the quarrel.

§ 28. But perhaps their most useful function consists in their power to deal with public questions which are outside the province of the individual trade union, but which closely concern them in the aggregate. This was pre-eminently the case during the agitation for the repeal of the criminal laws affecting labour, and for the enactment of just and salutary laws for the protection of the funds of trade societies. During the whole of this time they formed a centre of communication in each town; they arranged meetings, prepared petitions and got them signed, and corresponded with Members of Parliament. They were able to collect, transmit, and circulate information in their several districts, which could not have been done through the ordinary channels of the trade union. The immense demonstrations which took place in some of the great centres of industry, prior to the passing of the Labour Laws in 1875, were organised

by them, and they contributed not a little to the ultimate success of the movement, by their energy, devotion, and work.

§ 29. The most important, however, of all the functions relegated to trades' councils, is the power and authority to deal with political questions. This has to be exercised with great care, because the unions are composed of men of every shade of political opinion, from the dullest of Tories, to the dreamiest of Radicals. Mere party contests they do not, as a rule, take part in, but it is evident and apparent that they are steadily drifting into political agitation, and forming quasi-political organisations. This is not altogether to be regretted; it is rather desirable that they should take a more active part in political movements, especially in the higher and better sense; but they will do well to be independent of mere party, and petty faction. They must keep their hands clean in all such matters, and avoid absolutely everything involving bribery and corruption. They should also steer clear of local political wire-pullers, whose interest in an election is generally a question of mere pay; such as these will use the organisation for their own purposes, and then assist in crushing it. Scarcely an instance can be mentioned in which these local agents have ever rendered assistance, even in the most remote sense, to trade unions in any of their struggles. On the contrary, very many instances could be cited in which they opposed both measures and leaders, and used their power to obstruct both. With the full knowledge of these facts, and of the action taken by local political agents, it will be well for trade unionists to beware of them, and their doings.

§ 30. In point of numbers, the trades' councils of the country vary very considerably; in some towns they are strong, in others weak. They are also subject to great fluctuations; one year they may represent nearly the whole of the trades in the district, the next, there may have been enormous secessions. The following figures represent the strength of some of these councils in 1876–7, as detailed in the returns to the Trades Union Congress, held in Newcastle and Leicester, in September of each year: London, 18,184; Manchester, 10,000; Liverpool, 4,330; Birmingham, 4,000; Glasgow, 50,000; Leeds, 2,406;

Nottingham, 5,000; Leicester, 2,439; Edinburgh, 10,000; Aberdeen, 2,000; Dundee, 4,000; Newcastle, 6,000; Sheffield, 4,000; Oldham, 4,000; Wednesbury, 1,000; Paisley, 3,000; Bolton, 2,000; Bury, 1,000. The largest representation of trades' councils since 1876–7 was at the Dundee Congress, in 1887, when 26 trades' councils sent delegates to the Congress, 176,422 members of trade unions being represented by those councils. The largest of these were London, 26,000; Glasgow, 24,000; Oldham, 16,000; Bolton, 11,500; Edinburgh, 11,500; Manchester, 11,000; Newcastle, 8,826; Dundee, 7,000; Cardiff, 7,000; Hyde, 6,634; Aberdeen, 6,000; Nottingham, 5,000; Belfast, 5,000; Liverpool, 5,000; Leeds, 4,700; and Hull, 3,820. The others had from 3,000 to 1,000 members. This increase in numbers shows that trades' councils are becoming more and more a recognised institution in connection with the working of trade unions.

§ 31. The payments to the officials of trades' councils are usually merely nominal; generally their work is a labour of love only, not always without abuse. It is a singular fact, in our political and social history, that the least paid are generally the best abused; it is so in this case as in others. The late Mr. George Odger, who was for many years secretary of the London Trades' Council, used to say sadly, "My salary is at the low rate of half-a-crown a week;" his annual payment being only £6. Latterly, the secretary has been paid £40 a year, and the treasurer £6. In many towns no salary whatever is attached to the office, although there is plenty of work. Still men are always to be found willing to labour for the good of others, and they do it cheerfully, without fee or reward.

§ 32. The usefulness of trades' councils will be greatly enhanced, in proportion as they are able, and empowered, to deal with matters above and beyond mere questions of wages and labour. There are many subjects of growing interest, in which they may well take part, all of them having a direct bearing on the welfare of the working classes, but not absolutely confined to them: such as local government and taxation, the sanitary improvement of the homes of the people, the cost of living, and many other questions. Technical education is of especial interest

to the whole of the artisan classes, and should be earnestly and vigorously urged and promoted by the trades' councils of every town in the United Kingdom; no better medium exists for calling the attention of workmen to the value of scientific training, and its importance in the workshop, to operatives in all trades. The dissemination of information by means of lectures, and the circulation of good books, is another mode by which they can extend at once their usefulness and their influence, and at the same time add to the happiness of the great mass of the people. Some years ago, at the rooms of the Society of Arts, the London Trades' Council arranged for a series of Lectures on Health, by Dr. Corfield. These were attended by such numbers that the room would scarcely contain them. Other and similar courses might be arranged in every town in the country. Lecturers are numerous, audiences are plentiful, the only things required are: (1) men to organise them; (2) willing workers to do the necessary labour; and (3) means to give due publicity to the fact, and to pay the preliminary expenses. Trades' councils, if they like, can do all these. Efforts are being made, in various industrial centres, to turn these councils into political and Socialist agencies, for propagandist purposes. There is some scope for this policy in the organisation of the council. But if that policy should be largely developed the larger consolidated unions will assuredly withdraw, and thus weaken the council. The strength of trades' councils lies in the fact that they are purely industrial, on the lines of the unions they represent. But they have a wider scope than the unions within the lines laid down, and if they keep closely to their objects all will be well. If, however, the base of their operations is widely extended, the seeds of dissension will so grow as to destroy the products they were intended to cultivate.

III.—TRADES UNION CONGRESSES.

§ 33. The nearest approach to anything like federative action, on the part of trade unions, is to be found in the Annual Trades Union Congresses, which, from March, 1871, have had

a permanent committee, called the "Parliamentary Committee," elected on the last day but one of each successive Congress, whose duty it is to watch over all legislative matters affecting, directly or indirectly, the trade unionists of the country, and to initiate such measures as from time to time may be thought necessary, either for the purpose of amending laws already in existence, repealing those which are considered detrimental to their interests, or placing others on the statute-book which they deem expedient, just, and reasonable. Even those Congresses, viewed from one standpoint of a confederation of the trades, have hitherto been loose in organisation, and restricted in action, although the base of their operations has been considerably widened, in successive years. In some respects material improvements have been effected in the mode of conducting business, and in modes of representation, but the scope of their action is still extremely limited. In so far as the internal economy of trade unions is concerned, they have no more power to-day than they had when they were first instituted. Several attempts have been made to give them a more definite and permanent constitution, but without success up to the present time. At the Newcastle Congress, in 1876, "the proposed new constitution," prepared by the Parliamentary Committee, was rejected by 74 to 21 votes, the majority of the delegates being conservatively opposed to any tampering with that which had worked well in the past; as was tersely said: "They were going on well; let well alone." The annual Congresses date from one held in Manchester, in Whitsun-week, 1868, and not from that held previously in Sheffield, although the Hallamites lay claim to the parentage of these annual assemblies. The one held in Sheffield had reference more distinctly and directly to a scheme for effecting a fusion of the trades, on the basis of some form of federation. This attempt, however, was unsuccessful, as all prior attempts had been.

§ 34. The Trades Union Congress was instituted by the chief trade unions of the country. When the idea of holding these annual assemblies originated, trade unionists were under a dark cloud of suspicion. They were assailed in parliament, in the press, from the pulpit, and on the platform, with a virulence seldom equalled, certainly never surpassed, in the history of

public movements in this country. They had no representative in parliament to rebut the charges levelled against them, or to correct the misrepresentations to which they were subjected. They had no status in the press, and only occasionally were they defended by men of ability and of recognised literary standing, whose names and position ensured the appearance of their articles on the subject. The pulpit was of course closed to them, while its utterances were almost wholly condemnatory, among all denominations, without any exception. The charity which covereth a multitude of sins was in this case absent. The sins of trade unionists were too vile for charity. But the platform was left to them, and in this arena of debate the working-class leaders were fairly able to hold their own. Yet, even here, they were placed at a disadvantage. Halls for public meetings were not always available for trade union purposes. Exeter Hall was sometimes obtained, but only at great expense, and after a good deal of trouble, as the objects sought were "too political" at that date. The use of schoolrooms was almost invariably refused, both for meetings and for lodge purposes. The only places open to them were the public-houses. Driven there for shelter, is it any wonder that drinking was often an accompaniment to their debates, and an ingredient in their deliberations? Nevertheless, the evil was never so great as represented. Exaggeration was as rife with respect to the drinking habits of the workmen, as it was regarding their violent propensities in matters of coercion, intimidation, and outrage. In neither case was their conduct so bad as alleged by their enemies. Drunkenness was the exception—not the rule. If violent language was sometimes used, it was the violence of words only, not of deeds or acts. As a matter of fact the language of speakers was not violent, in the proper sense of the term; it was simply the rough and strong expressions in customary use, among the then not over-educated working people. And if it had been as violent as frequently described, it was caused by the injustice with which they, and their demands, were treated.

§ 35. The proximate and immediate causes which led to the establishment of the Trades Union Congresses were: (1) The

appointment of the Royal Commission to inquire into the Organisation and Rules of Trade Unions; and (2) the decision of the Lord Chief Justice, in the case of Hornby *v.* Close, which virtually declared that Trade Unions, being in restraint of trade, could not enforce agreements in a court of law, and that, consequently, their funds and property were absolutely without legal protection. The object of the inquiry by the Royal Commission was undoubtedly to find a pretext and justification for the suppression of the unions. This purpose was clearly indicated in the speeches in parliament, and more particularly by the movers and seconders of the Address to the Crown. It also found expression in the newspaper press generally. A leading London daily newspaper said: "The unions must be stamped out as a public nuisance." This threat of suppression on the one hand, and the danger of their funds being placed in jeopardy by the decision referred to, on the other, drew the unions closer together in common defence, first of all by means of a special committee sitting in London, with the view of averting what might have been a national disaster. The promptitude and activity of that committee did excellent service, although it was but a temporary expedient to meet a present difficulty; the work, however, was so well done that it resulted in a permanent advantage. Under these circumstances the bold policy was conceived and devised of calling together a Congress to deal with matters pertaining to trade unions specifically, and affecting generally the interests of the artisans of the United Kingdom. A brief but succinct account of the successive Congresses which have taken place, will show the nature of their work, the progress made in domestic and social legislation, the objects generally sought, the results that have followed, and the pecuniary cost by which all the advantages have been attained.

§ 36. I. Manchester, *June 2nd to 6th*, 1868.—When the first Congress assembled in Manchester, in Whit-week, 1868, the dark cloud which had been hanging over the unions had burst. Instead, however, of overwhelming them in confusion, disaster, and ruin, the storm had partially spent itself without serious harm. But the danger was by no means past. The

final report of the Royal Commission had not appeared, and it was awaited with some forebodings of evil consequences, in the then state of public feeling in the country, mainly evoked by the disclosures at Sheffield, Manchester, and Nottingham. The meeting was held in the Mechanics' Institute, thirty-four delegates being present from Manchester, London, Liverpool, Bradford, Birmingham, Bolton, Leeds, Nottingham, Preston, Sheffield, Salford, Dublin, and some other towns, representing, according to the credentials handed in, about 118,367 members. The subjects discussed at this Congress included the absolute necessity of Trade Unions, Foreign Competition, Political Economy, Regulation of the Hours of Labour, the Factory Acts Extension Act, 1867; Courts of Conciliation and Arbitration in Trade Disputes (paper by Mr. Mundella), Co-operation, Compulsory Inspection of all places where Women and Children are employed, the Law of Conspiracy as applied to Labour, Coercion, Picketing, and Intimidation; the Royal Commission on Trade Unions—how far worthy of the confidence of Trade Unionists; Legislation as regards Trade Societies and their Funds; and, lastly, the necessity for Annual Trades Union Congresses. The subjects above enumerated indicate the preliminary character of the gathering, and show that the delegates attending it were but feeling their way towards a more permanent form of organisation—one which should be capable of undertaking continuously, serious, responsible, and durable work. The expenses of this Congress were provided by a fee of 10*s.* for each delegate, as his share of the cost.

§ 37. II. Birmingham, *August 23rd to 28th*, 1869.—The first Congress provided for the assembling of the second, by electing Birmingham as the place in which it should be held, and by relegating the duty of calling it to the trades' council of that town. Accordingly, the second Congress assembled in the Oddfellows' Hall, Temple Street, on August 23rd, 1869. Forty associations were represented by forty-eight delegates, the numbers represented being 250,000, as stated in the credential forms. The chief topics of debate were the Inquiry by, and the Reports of, the Royal Commission, and the Unprotected state of Trade Union Funds. Papers were also read, and

discussions took place upon, Piece-work, Overtime, Limitation of Apprentices, the Protection of Miners' Lives, Conciliation and Arbitration, Co-operation and Industrial Partnerships, National Education, Assisted Emigration, the objects and uses of Trade Unions, Strikes and Lock-outs. It was at this Congress that the question was first mooted of Labour Representation in Parliament, as a distinctive policy of the unions. This Congress was more political in its composition and complexion than the previous one, for bodies other than trade unions were represented at it, without challenge. London was chosen as the place of the next Congress, and some five of the London delegates were elected as a committee to make arrangements therefor.

§ 38. III. London, *March 6th to 11th*, 1871.—The third Congress was not called together in 1870, as was intended. This break of a year turned out to be rather fortunate, as it enabled the Congress to deal with the Trade Union Bill, introduced by the Home Secretary on February 14, and the Mines Regulation Bill on the 13th of the same month. The third Congress assembled in the Portland Rooms, on March 6, 1871. Fifty delegates were present, from 49 societies, representing 289,430 members. The chief subject of discussion was the Trade Union Bill, the third section of which re-enacted, with intensified force, the criminal provisions of previous statutes, as interpreted by some of the judges. The entire section was strongly condemned, and the Government was urged, by a large deputation, to withdraw it. They so far yielded as to omit it from the Bill; but it was brought in as a separate measure, and passed, simultaneously with the Trade Union Act, as the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871. The other important subjects discussed were: the Mines' Regulation Bill, the Truck System and Weekly Payment of Wages, the Factory and Workshops Acts, and the Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture. Time was also found for the discussion of Convict Labour, Taxation, Cultivation of Waste Lands, Unemployed Labour, Emigration, and the International Fraternisation of Labour. Although resolutions were passed regarding these, and some other matters not pressing for immediate attention, the Congress manifested a distinctive tendency towards Parliamentary action and legislative

work. Mere theoretical papers and discussions were tolerated rather than encouraged, the general feeling being in favour of practical measures, of immediate necessity, as the one thing needful. Steps were taken to reduce the assembly to a system of order and regularity—as to meeting annually, representation, and the payment of expenses. A fee of 10*s.* was fixed as the payment of each delegate on the presentation of his credentials, as his society's share towards the expenses of Congress; this rule has been operative ever since. The amount thus realised was £24 10*s.*; the expenses of the Congress, inclusive of all secretarial work, amounted to £9 14*s.*; leaving a balance of £14 16*s.* to meet the expenses during the year until the next Congress assembled. A Parliamentary Committee of five was elected, including the chairman and secretary of the Congress, to watch events, and to take such action as might be deemed advisable during the then Session of Parliament, having reference to the matters discussed, and the decisions of the Congress. At this gathering Mr. Samuel Plimsoll first explained his proposals for ensuring the safety of "our seamen," and bespoke the sympathy of the delegates on their behalf. Substantial aid was subsequently rendered.

§ 39. IV. NOTTINGHAM, *January 8th to 13th*, 1872.—The fourth Congress assembled at Nottingham, on January 8, 1872. It was decided to meet early in the year, so as to be ready with a programme of work for the ensuing Session of Parliament. The number of delegates present was 77, representing 63 societies, and a total of 255,710 members, according to the credential forms handed in. Of the total, twelve delegates were sent by political bodies, a system then for the first time authoritatively condemned, and since that date never repeated, at least not with the sanction of Congress. The income from fees amounted to £38 10*s.*, the expenditure being £31 1*s.* 7*d.*; leaving a balance of £7 8*s.* 5*d.*, to which was added £1 given by a gentleman in sympathy with the objects of the Congress, towards the expenses of the current year. This is the only instance of outside help being accepted, though often proffered by sympathising friends. The only amount contributed towards the expenses of the Parliamentary Committee in the year was £2,

being 10*s.* each from four societies. To avoid further detailed repetition, the number of delegates present, societies and members represented, the income and expenditure of the Congress, and the Committee, together with the balances in hand at the close of each year, are tabulated in the Appendix. At the Nottingham Congress the Parliamentary Committee presented its first report, giving an account of its action during the preceding year—a practice which has been followed at all successive Congresses. As an appendix to the report, the committee presented a careful digest of the two Acts having reference to trade unions, together with a record of all the cases tried under the Criminal Law Amendment Act up to that date. This record was subsequently printed, and brought under the notice of the Home Secretary, by a deputation representing the Congress. The discussions related mainly to the two Acts above mentioned, and to the Bills to be introduced during the Session of 1872—namely, a Mines' Regulation Bill, a Bill for the abolition of Truck and ensuring the weekly payment of wages, a Bill for compensating the families of workmen for losses sustained by injuries inflicted while following their employment, and a Bill for amending the laws relating to arbitration in trade disputes. The committee were also instructed to watch carefully the proposed legislation with respect to Friendly Societies, and to agitate for the appointment of an efficient staff of inspectors under the Factory and Workshops Acts, with the view to their being more efficiently administered. The only other questions discussed were: Foreign labour and competition, how best to utilise the Funds of Trade Unions, and the organisation and management of Trades' Councils. A few other desultory topics were introduced, but Congress decided that papers and discussions in defence of trade unions and cognate subjects were unnecessary. The Parliamentary Committee was enlarged from five to ten members, and charged with the duty of preparing a code of Standing Orders for the government of future Congresses. It was also decided that all business relating to Congress be relegated to a Standing Orders Committee of five, to be elected on the first day of each succeeding Congress, by whom the order of procedure, questions to be discussed, and all matters of detail should be arranged

and formulated. The initial steps were thus definitely taken for organising and establishing Congress on a permanent basis as an institution, its constitution being then practically settled. Since that date it has not materially changed in any respect. Nottingham set an example which has since been followed in other towns—namely, the mayor entertained the delegates at a sumptuous banquet in the Town Hall, and the townspeople threw open their houses to the delegates in a way which was most generous and surprising. In fact, there was nearly as much feasting as work—early breakfasts, almost before daylight, public luncheons, late dinners, and evening soirées were provided in profusion. Other towns have been generous, but Nottingham eclipsed them all.

§ 40. V. Leeds, *January 13th to 18th*, 1873.—The fifth Congress met in the New Assembly Rooms, Leeds, on January 13, 1873. The report of the Parliamentary Committee was an elaborate one. It dealt with the various subjects mentioned in the Nottingham programme, but more especially with the Mines' Regulation Act, and the Arbitration Act, both carried in 1872, and with the Factories' Nine Hours Bill, the Master and Servants' Wages (Truck) Bill; Workmen's and Servants' Compensation for Injuries Bill, and the prosecutions under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. The report concluded with a carefully prepared synopsis of questions to be dealt with in the ensuing Session, formulated into a distinct programme of work. This also has become a feature in each successive year's report. The discussions were for the most part confined to the several matters mentioned in the report, resolutions embodying the views of Congress being passed with respect to them. The Standing Orders prepared by the committee were submitted, discussed, and adopted, with a few verbal alterations. These, with slight modifications and some few amendments, have governed the Congress since that time. Resolutions were also passed condemning the employment of soldiers in times of labour disputes, and one severely criticising the sentences passed on the gas-stokers by Mr. Justice Brett. The first copies of Mr. Plimsoll's famous book, "Our Seamen," were circulated at this Congress.

§ 41. VI. Sheffield, *January 12th to 17th*, 1874.—The sixth Congress met in the Temperance Hall, Sheffield, on January 12th, 1874. The Parliamentary Committee's report was a lengthy one, dealing with some dozen questions, more or less in detail. These included the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871; Master and Servant Act, 1867; the Conspiracy Laws; the Trade Union Act, 1871; the Jury Laws; Compensation for Injuries; Payment of Wages; Factory Acts; Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates; Federation of Employers, etc. Some discussion also took place upon the question of Federating Trade Unions, our Merchant Seamen, Shop Assistants' Hours of Labour, and the grievances of Postal Employés. In consequence of the way in which the numbers represented were duplicated in the credentials handed in, the committee were ordered to report thereon at the next Congress.

§ 42. VII. Liverpool, *January 18th to 23rd*, 1875.—The seventh Congress assembled in the Concert Hall, Lord Nelson Street, on Monday, January 18. The state of the representation was improved as regards the duplication of numbers, etc. The report was an elaborate one, dealing with some eighteen different subjects, but for the most part it traversed the same ground as theretofore. The interest of the gathering mainly centred on those portions of the report which dealt with the Report of the Royal Commission on the Labour Laws, appointed by the Government on coming into office in 1874. The Congress rejected the scheme of federation prepared by the committee, and it referred back the proposed new constitution, for governing the Congress, for further consideration. Neither of these schemes has had the sanction of Congress, though both have been discussed at subsequent gatherings.

§ 43. VIII. Glasgow, *October 11th to 16th*, 1875.—The eighth Congress assembled in Glasgow in the autumn, as above, in consequence of a change of date, carried at the previous Congress. The report dealt with twenty different subjects, but the chief topic of debate was the "workmen's victory"—the passing of the "Labour Laws"—in the session of 1875. It was the celebration of a great triumph, after years of hard work; but it was also the starting-point of a new departure, covering a wider

field, social and political. The Labour Laws having been passed, the then secretary, the present writer, resigned on account of ill-health and need of rest, Mr. Henry Broadhurst being elected in his stead. No new subjects of moment were added to the programme.

§ 44. IX. NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, *September 18th to 23rd*, 1876.—The ninth Congress assembled in the Mechanics' Institute, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on Monday, September 18th, 1876. The report dealt with twelve different subjects, the chief one being the Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment Act, 1876, which Act had embodied every suggested improvement made by successive Congresses since 1871. The other special subjects dealt with were: The extension of the provisions as to breaches of contract in the Employers and Workmen Act, 1875; to Seamen while in British waters; the Lord Chancellor's Rules for carrying out the before-mentioned Act; the Report of the Royal Commission on Factories and Workshops; and Co-operation. No new subject was introduced into the programme, but a valuable paper on the Codification of the Law was presented from the pen of Mr. Henry Crompton; this subject, by a resolution of Congress, was added to the committee's programme; and also one for amending the law as to the qualification for seats on town councils.

§ 45. X. LEICESTER, *September 17th to 22nd*, 1877.—The tenth Congress met on Monday, September 17th, 1877, in the Temperance Hall, Leicester. The report dealt with twenty-two different subjects. The new questions introduced had reference to the Justices Clerks' Act, 1877; the proposals for a Criminal Code Bill; the abolition of Imprisonment for Debt; Danish Trade Unions; and Thrift. Sir Thomas (now Lord) Brassey gave addresses on "Work and Wages in 1877," and on "Labour at Home and Abroad." These papers gave a tone to the Congress, and influenced the discussions during the week.

§ 46. XI. BRISTOL, *September 9th to 14th*, 1878.—The eleventh Congress assembled in the Athenæum, Bristol, on September 9th, 1878. The report of the committee dealt with some sixteen subjects, the most prominent being the Employers' Liability for Injury Bill, the Factory and Workshops Consolida-

tion Act, and the Merchant Seamen's Bill. The programme for the next year was reduced to nine subjects, no new questions being introduced. The notable event of this Congress was Mr. John Morley's paper on "Over-Production," an address much commented upon at the time.

§ 47. XII. EDINBURGH, *September 15th to 20th*, 1879.—The twelfth Congress met in the Oddfellows' Hall, Edinburgh, on September 15th, 1879. The report dealt with nineteen subjects, the most important being the Employers' Liability Bills and the Criminal Code Bill, before Parliament, and the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879. Three new questions were added to the programme—namely, Reform of the Land Laws, Assimilation of the Borough and County Franchise, and the Extension of the Hours of Polling, all distinctly political. Mr. R. S. Wright read an interesting paper on "Labour and Land Questions."

§ 48. XIII. DUBLIN, *September 13th to 18th*, 1880.—The thirteenth Congress assembled in the Ancient Concert Room, Dublin, on September 13th, 1880. The report of the committee dealt with twelve subjects, the chief being the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, the Act for Regulating the carrying of Grain Cargoes in bulk, and the Act extending the provisions of the Employers and Workmen Act to British Seamen. The only new subject introduced was the Irish Land Laws. Dr. Ingram delivered an admirable address on "Work and Workmen;" and Dr. Hancock, an equally excellent address on the Poor Laws of England and Ireland. The Congress was a successful one.

§ 49. XIV. LONDON, *September 12th to 17th*, 1881.—The fourteenth Congress met in London, in St. Andrew's Hall, Newman Street, on September 12th, 1881. The report dealt with eighteen different subjects, some of which were outside the province of legislation. The committee referred with pride to the fact that one of their number had been appointed an Inspector of Factories and Workshops, under the new Act; and they intimated that this was but the thin end of the wedge as regards Inspectorships — a prediction subsequently fulfilled. Mr. Inderwick, Q.C., read a valuable paper on the "Codification of the Criminal Law." Some noisy debates took place at this Congress on Fair Trade, mainly at the instigation of certain

persons who had managed to get in as delegates, but who were afterwards expelled. These were six in number, their expenses having been paid by private individuals, or by associations outside trade unions, in violation of the standing orders of Congress.

§ 50. XV. MANCHESTER, *September 18th to 23rd*, 1882.—The fifteenth Congress assembled in Manchester, the home of its birth, on Monday, September 18th, in the Co-operative Hall. The report dealt with twelve different subjects, the most important being the Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill, Codification of the Criminal Law, Payment of Wages in Public-houses Prevention Bill, Factory and Workshops Inspection, Reform of the Cab Laws, Land Law Reform, the Settled Estates Act, Registrars' Charges for Certificates of Death, and Co-operation. Other questions were discussed, such as the Poor-Law System, the Public Health Act, 1875, Regulation of Bakehouses, and Infant Mortality. Three or four of the subjects were new ones, and several were more distinctively political than those formerly discussed.

§ 51. XVI. NOTTINGHAM, *September 10th to 15th*, 1883.—The sixteenth Congress assembled in the Mechanics' Hall, Nottingham, on September 10th, 1883. The report of the committee dealt with thirteen different subjects, only one of which was new. Four of the matters dealt with were political, rather than social or industrial; eight were legislative and social, and one was a matter of industrial organisation—the projected Labour Congress in Paris.

§ 52. XVII. ABERDEEN, *September 8th to 13th*, 1884.—The seventeenth Congress opened at Aberdeen, on September 8th, 1884, in the Public Hall. Savings Banks, the Hours of Labour, and International Trade Unionism were among the new subjects discussed. Lord Rosebery and Lord Aberdeen were present at this Congress, the former delivering an address. The increasing tendency to political action was again manifested at this gathering.

§ 53. XVIII. SOUTHPORT, *September 7th to 12th*, 1885.—The eighteenth Congress assembled at Southport, on September 7th, 1885, in the Cambridge Hall. The report dealt with some

fourteen subjects, two of which were new—namely, Government Contracts and Colonial questions. The most important matter which engaged the attention of this Congress was the adoption of an "Address to the Trades," in view of the approaching general election in November of that year, setting forth sixteen questions to be supported and voted for by candidates.

§ 54. XIX. Hull, *September 6th to 11th*, 1886.—The nineteenth Congress met in Hull, on September 6th, 1886. At this gathering Free Education was added to the programme, and a Labour Electoral Committee was appointed to secure increased labour representation in Parliament.

§ 55. XX. Swansea, *September 5th to 10th*, 1887.—The twentieth Congress assembled in Swansea, on September 5, 1887. The new questions discussed included the right of Public Meeting in Ireland, Trade Marks, Sanitary Inspection, and the Revision of the Statute Law.

§ 56. XXI. Bradford, *September 3rd to 8th*, 1888.—The twenty-first Congress assembled in Bradford, on September 3, 1888. The report was shorter than usual, in consequence of the Parliamentary Session not being closed, and fewer subjects were dealt with. The chief interest of the gathering centred in the discussion on the proposed Eight Hours' Day.

§ 57. XXII. Dundee, *September 2nd* to *7th*, 1889.—The twenty-second Congress assembled in the Gilfillan Hall, Dundee, on September 2nd, 1889. The number of delegates present was stated to be 210, but the Congress fees accounted for 211; the total number of Societies, Trades' Councils, or branches of Societies represented was 171; while the total number of members represented was 885,055. The representation was larger than on any previous occasion, but an investigation of the printed list shows that the increase was mainly local, although certain other societies sent additional delegates. For example, the Sailors and Firemen's Union sent fourteen representatives from as many branches, that body having never been represented before, except by two delegates in 1888; the Trades' Council of Dundee had five delegates, and there were some fourteen or fifteen other delegates from the Dundee trades, or branches of trades. Nevertheless, the representation of the

trades generally at the Dundee Congress was unusually large—to some extent the result of a spirit of rivalry. The Report of the Parliamentary Committee dealt with the following subjects: The Employers' Liability Bill; Railway Regulation Bill; Cotton Cloth Factories Bill; Amendment of the Merchandise Marks Act; Quarries Regulation Bill; Amendment of the Factories and Workshop Acts; the Parliamentary Inquiry into the Sweating System; Enginemen's Certificate Bill; Payment of Members of Parliament; Mineral Royalties and Wayleaves; the London International Congress; the International Labour Convention; Labour Statistics; Co-operation; and some miscellaneous matters. The Report also referred to the death of Mr. J. S. Murchie, immediately after the Bradford Congress, and concluded with references to some attacks on the Secretary of the Committee, and other well-known trade unionists, and to an organised effort to prevent financial aid being given to carry on the work of Congress. At the conclusion of the President's address, the Report of the Committee was discussed at some length, on an amendment to the motion that it be adopted, to leave out the last four paragraphs, viz., those which referred to dissensions, to the endeavour to prevent financial aid being given, and to the attacks upon the Secretary and others of the Committee. The discussion that ensued was personal, and sometimes bitter. Mr. Broadhurst and Mr. Shipton came in for the lion's share of abuse; but they were as vigorously defended by the oldest and best-known of the representatives to Congress, while the attacks were made by new men, several of whom appeared at these gatherings for the first time. On a division the Report was adopted by 142 to 18; majority, 124. The Standing Orders were then suspended, on the suggestion of the Standing Orders Committee, to enable the Congress to deal specifically with the attacks made upon Mr. Broadhurst, the Secretary. With this view, Mr. John Wilson, who was the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee, moved: "That the Congress expresses its entire confidence in Mr. Broadhurst, M.P., as Secretary of the Parliamentary Committee, and that it was its opinion that the charges circulated about him were untrue." To this an amendment was proposed, accusing

Mr. Broadhurst of "supporting at election times sweaters and unfair employers of labour," and declaring that he was "not a fit and proper person to act as Secretary," etc. After a long discussion, in which personalities were freely indulged in, Mr. Broadhurst was called upon to address the Congress. In his speech, often interrupted by his opponents, he rebutted the charges made against him, evidently to the satisfaction of the Congress, for when the vote was taken, 11 only voted for the amendment, and 177 for the motion. The vote of confidence was therefore carried by a majority of 169, amid loud cheers. The Congress then proceeded with its ordinary business. The credentials of Miss Simcox, a lady who had attended several previous Congresses, were rejected, as not fulfilling the conditions of the Standing Orders. Mr. Mawdsley presented the report of the Committee on the Eight Hours Question. Only 33 societies, representing a total membership of 169,540, made a return. Of these, 39,629 voted in favour of eight hours, and 62,883 against it. For an Eight Hours Day by Act of Parliament there were 28,489 for, and 12,274 against. The number of votes recorded was 102,512, and the majority against an Eight Hours Day was 23,254. Resolutions were then carried in favour of amending the Employers' Liability Act; the law as to Coroners' Inquests in Scotland; Labour Representations in Parliament; and the other subjects mentioned in the programme of the Congress. It was decided that the next Congress be held in Liverpool, in September, 1890.

§ 58. In addition to the foregoing, International Trades Union Congresses were held in Paris on October 29 to November 3, 1883, and on August 23 to 28, 1886, and a third in London on November 6 to 10, 1888. The subjects discussed at these gatherings were similar to those dealt with at the twenty-two Congresses before enumerated, except that they were more intensely political, and State aid was more generally invoked. The preceding record is but a brief outline of the history and labours of an institution which has now existed over twenty-two years, since June 2, 1868. When called into existence, trade unions were under the ban of the law. Their funds and property were unprotected. They were

misrepresented, reviled, calumniated, and opposed on all hands. The earlier Congresses were ridiculed, and the leading men taking part in them were soundly abused. In fact, the chances seemed to be that the unions would be suppressed, and their leaders probably imprisoned, ere the second gathering was called together to deliberate as to ways and means. Now, all is changed. Persecution could not kill them; let us hope that prosperity will not weaken their strength.

§ 59. The nature, constitution, character, scope, and definite aims and objects of these Congresses may be summarised briefly as follows: The Trades Union Congresses meet yearly. Their sittings last six days—Monday to Saturday inclusive. The meeting-place is chosen by the whole Congress, by vote. They are thoroughly representative, the delegates being elected and paid by the various societies and councils sending them. Each delegate must present a credential duly signed by the officers of his society, together with 10*s.* towards expenses, which fee must be paid by the society. They are wholly self-supporting —the Congress itself by the fees, and the Parliamentary Committee by voluntary contributions from trade unions or trades' councils. No outside help is accepted. Political and other associations are not permitted to send delegates, nor can they, or private individuals, subscribe or pay any of the fees. The Parliamentary Committee is practically a permanent body, elected by the whole Congress yearly. No delegate can be elected whose society has not contributed during the preceding year. Only one of a trade can be elected. The competition for a seat on the committee is usually very keen, and scarcely less so for the place of meeting. The committee carry on the work from year to year, on the lines laid down by Congress, and report their proceedings to the Congress on the day of assembling. The business of Congress is relegated to a Standing Orders Committee, by whom each day's work is formulated and arranged, who also examine and report on the credentials of delegates and finances of the Congress. The only paid officer of the Congress is the Parliamentary Secretary, whose salary now is £200 a year; but an honorarium of £15 is voted yearly to the treasurer. The other expenses consist of offices, printing, stationery,

postages, parliamentary papers, and the like. The tables in the Appendix show the income and expenditure, year by year, the places of meeting, numbers represented, delegates present, and other details, both as to management and representation.

§ 60. With respect to the labours of Congress—the work year by year formulated into a programme and accomplished up to date—it is necessary first of all to remember what has been previously said as to the position of trade unions, and of labour questions generally, at the date of their foundation. Bearing this in mind, it will be seen that the record is by no means an inglorious one; indeed, it is quite the reverse.

Measures, 1868 to 1889 inclusive.—With the extended franchise, given in 1867, and the immense activity of the trade unions in the year of the first Congress, preparatory to the general election of 1868, came the first gleam of hope to the organised toilers of the United Kingdom, in the shape of remedial legislation. The measures which have been more or less the outcome of the combined action of the trade unions, are as follows:

1868. The Recorders' Act, 31 and 32 Vict. c. 116, which gave power for the first time to punish defaulting officers of trade unions.
1869. Trade Unions (Protection of Funds), 32 and 33 Vict. c. 61.
1870. Factories and Workshops Acts (Extension), 33 and 34 Vict. c. 62.
1870. Attachment of Wages—England and Ireland, 33 and 34 Vict. c. 30.
1870. Arrestment of Wages—Act to limit, 33 and 34 Vict. c. 63.
1871. The Trade Union Act, 34 and 35 Vict. c. 31. (See also 1876.)
1872. The Mines Regulation Acts—Coal Mines, 35 and 36 Vict. c. 76; and Metalliferous Mines, 35 and 36 Vict. c. 77.
1872. The Masters and Workmen Arbitration Act, 35 and 36 Vict. c. 46.
1874. Factories (Health of Women) Act, 37 and 38 Vict. c. 44.
1874. Hosiery Manufacture Act, 37 and 38 Vict. c. 48, to provide for the payment of Wages without stoppages.

1874. Alkali Works Act, 37 and 38 Vict. c. 43.
1875. The Employers and Workmen Act, 38 and 39 Vict. c. 90.
1875. Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 38 and 39 Vict. c. 86.
1875. The Friendly Societies Act, 38 and 39 Vict. c. 60.
1875. Unseaworthy Ships, 38 and 39 Vict. c. 88.
1876. Trade Union Act Amendment Act, 39 and 40 Vict. c. 22.
1876. The Merchant Shipping Act, 39 and 40 Vict. c. 80.
1877. The Justices' Clerks Act, 40 and 41 Vict. c. 43.
1877. The Canal Boats Act, 40 and 41 Vict. c. 60. (Promoted by Mr. George Smith.)
1878. The Factory and Workshops Consolidation Act, 41 and 42 Vict. c. 16, in which many and most important Amendments to the original Acts were incorporated.
1878. Weights and Measures Act, 41 and 42 Vict. c. 49, as to the measurement of coal, among other provisions.
1879. The Summary Jurisdiction Act, 42 and 43 Vict. c. 49. The passing of this Act was materially aided by the action of Congress.
1880. Employers Liability Act, 43 and 44 Vict. c. 42.
1880. Merchant Seamen—Payment of Wages Act, 43 and 44 Vict. c. 16.
1880. Merchant Shipping Act—Grain Cargoes, 43 and 44 Vict. c. 18.
1881. Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879—extension to Scotland, 44 and 45 Vict. c. 24, and c. 33; two Acts.
1881. Bankruptcy Act, Scotland, 44 and 55 Vict. c. 22; embodied many provisions relating to and advantageous to labour, and especially as to small debts, practically abolishing imprisonment for debt.
1881. Alkali Works Regulation, 44 and 45 Vict. c. 37.
1882. Metalliferous Mines Act, 45 and 46 Vict. c. 3.
1882. Boiler Explosions—Witness, etc., 44 and 45 Vict. c. 22.
1882. Summary Jurisdiction (Procedure), Ireland, 44 and 45 Vict. c. 24.
1883. Bankruptcy Act—England, 45 and 46, c. 52; embodied provisions relating to imprisonment for small debts, etc.

1883. Factories Act Extension, 45 and 46 Vict. c. 53; Bakehouses, White-lead Works, etc.
1883. The Companies Act, 45 and 46 Vict. c. 28.
1883. The Patents Act, 45 and 46 Vict. c. 57, gave four years' protection for £4, made payments on easier scale than formerly.
1884. Amendment of the Rules of Employers and Workmen Act, 1875—various important modifications therein.
1884. The Canal Boats Act, 47 and 48 Vict. c. 75.
1884. Master and Servant—Prohibition of the Payment of Wages in Public-houses Act, 47 and 48 Vict. c. 31.
1884. Extension of the Hours of Polling Act, 47 and 48 Vict. c. 34.
1884–5. Extension of the Franchise Act, 48 and 49 Vict. c. 3.
1884–5. Redistribution of Seats Act, 48 and 49 Vict. c. 23.
1884–5. Designs, Patents, and Trade Marks Act, 48 and 49 Vict. c. 63.
1886. Coal Mines Amendment Act, 49 and 50 Vict. c. 40.
1886. Bankruptcy—Agricultural Labourers' Wages, 49 and 50 Vict. c. 28.
1886. Act to Limit Hours of Labour of Women and Children in Shops, 49 and 50 Vict. c. 55.
1887. Fencing of Quarries Act, 50 and 51 Vict. c. 19.
1887. Fraudulent Marks Act, 50 and 51 Vict. c. 28.
1887. The Stannaries Act (Mines), 50 and 51 Vict. c. 43.
1887. The Truck Act, 50 and 51 Vict. c. 46.
1887. The Mines Consolidation Act, 50 and 51 Vict. c. 58.
1888. Law of Distress Amendment Act, 51 and 52 Vict. c. 21.
1888. Factory and Workshops Act, 51 and 52 Vict. c. 22.
1888. Merchant Shipping—Saving Life at Sea, 51 and 52 Vict. c. 24.
1889. Cotton Cloth Factories Act, 52 and 53 Vict. c. 62.
1889. Master and Servant Act, 52 and 53 Vict. c. 24.

The preceding list is but a bare record of measures more or less promoted by or the direct result of the action of the trade unions and their Congresses, and more recently by that of the Labour Representatives in parliament; but it does not exhaust the list, inasmuch as other Acts were altered, amended,

extended, or modified, by reason of the action and decisions of Congress. Inquiries have also been instituted at their instigation during the past two-and-twenty years. This surely is a noble record of work actually accomplished. More has been attempted.

§ 61. *Social Advancement.*—When the Congresses were first instituted, labour representation, in any form, was but a dream, although Mr. Howell and Mr. Cremer were candidates at the election of 1868, the first-named for Aylesbury, and the latter for Warwick. The progress made since that date is quite marvellous, as the following facts will show :

In 1874, the late Mr. Alexander Macdonald and Mr. Thomas Burt were elected to sit in parliament; the former for Stafford, and the latter for Morpeth. At the same general election Mr. Howell stood again for Aylesbury, and Mr. Broadhurst for Wycombe, both being unsuccessful. Since that date, beginning in 1880, when Mr. H. Broadhurst was elected, and subsequently in 1885 and 1886 Mr. J. Arch, Mr. W. Crawford, Mr. W. R. Cremer, Mr. C. Fenwick, Mr. J. Leicester, Mr. B. Pickard, Mr. W. Abraham, Mr. J. Wilson, Mr. J. Rowlands, and the present writer, have all found seats in the House of Commons. Mr. J. Leicester, Mr. J. Wilson, and Mr. J. Arch, lost their seats in 1886, the remaining nine being still in the House of Commons.

One Member, Mr. Broadhurst, was promoted to a position in Her Majesty's Government. Several have been members of Royal Commissions—namely, Mr. Applegarth, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Birtwistle, and Mr. Shipton, while some others have recently been added to the list. Several have been appointed Justices of the Peace, such as Mr. H. Slatter, Mr. T. Birtwistle, Mr. W. Pickard, and Mr. J. Mawdsley. Several have been appointed Inspectors under the Factories and Workshops Acts, such as Mr. J. D. Prior, Mr. W. J. Davis, Mr. W. Paterson, Mr. A. Platt, Mr. J. Pearson, Mr. J. T. Birtwistle, and Mr. G. Sedgwick. Mr. G. Shipton and Mr. C. J. Drummond have been appointed Honorary Visitors of Convict Prisons; Mr. J. Burnett, as Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade; and, in numerous instances, working men have won seats on School Boards, Municipal

Councils, Vestries, Local Boards, and, more recently, on County Councils; while Messrs. Birtwistle, Burnett, and Burt, were appointed by Her Majesty's Government to represent this country at the International Labour Conference called by the Emperor of Germany at Berlin. These appointments and positions give extended power and influence to the bodies of working men by whom such positions were obtained, and extend the sphere of usefulness of those who have been so elected or promoted.

§ 62. *Summary of Cost.*—The Tables in the Appendix show, in detail, the entire income and expenditure of the institution during the twenty-two years of its existence, and also the representation at each Congress. It will therefore be sufficient if a brief summary be given here.

(*a*) The entire income from delegates' fees has amounted to £1,417 10*s.*; the total expenditure in connection with the Congresses has been £1,037 19*s.* 5*d.*, leaving a balance to the good, after payment of all expenses, of £379 10*s.* 7*d.* In one instance only did the expenses of Congress exceed the income—namely, 1876, at Newcastle, when the deficit was £6 17*s.* 8*d.* The Congress balances are carried to the account of the Parliamentary Committee, yearly.

(*b*) The total income of the Parliamentary Committee, from the voluntary contributions of the trades, exclusive of the Congress balances, has amounted to £11,065 1*s.* 2*d.*; the aggregate expenditure has been £11,446 12*s.*; the balance at the close of last Congress, as stated in the Report, was £68 16*s.* 8*d.* There appears to be a slight inaccuracy somewhere, arising, perhaps, from the amalgamation of the two accounts a few years ago. Of the total expenditure, only some £2,860 17*s.* have been paid as salaries, and £3,195 10*s.* 1*d.* as the cost of the meetings of the Parliamentary Committee and Delegations. The balance has been expended in printing, stationery, postage and parcels, parliamentary papers, rent, gas, fuel, office expenses, and clerical assistance. Truly it is a splendid record, for so trifling a cost to the great trade unions of the United Kingdom.

§ 63. *Early Pioneers—Death's Doings.*—It would scarcely

be becoming, in this record of work, to close this chapter without some reference to the early pioneers in this labour movement—to the men whose voices are now silent, and whose places know them no more. Death has been gathering in its harvest apace, since the first Congress met in Manchester, in Whitsun-week twenty-two years ago. It is fitting that some of these names should be recalled, and their labours remembered, especially at a time when the labourers in this vineyard appear to be so numerous, many of whom scarcely even remember the earlier workers, certainly never co-operated with them; were not in the struggle when dangers were braved, and the pioneer victories were won. Of those whose names figured in connection with the earlier Congresses, and who by their ability and character helped, not only to found the institution, but to direct its councils, and give it a permanent place in the land—many have departed; indeed, few remain. The best known, of those who are no more, are George Odger, William Allan, Daniel Guile, Alexander Macdonald, John Kane, Peter Shorrocks, Alfred Bailey, John Whalley, William Pickard, John Normansell, and later on, James S. Murchie. Some have dropped out of the ranks; others have been promoted to positions of honour and trust; a few remain to take part in the Congress, to be held at Liverpool, in September next. Such is the record of twenty-two years of laborious work, in connection with Trades Union Congresses.*

* For summary of dates, places, income, expenditure, etc., of the several Congresses, see Appendix.

CHAPTER XI.

LABOUR AND CAPITAL IN CONSULTATION AND DEBATE.

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION IN TRADE DISPUTES.

I.—BOARDS OF CONCILIATION.

§ 1. HITHERTO we have mainly considered capital and labour in the attitude of active antagonism, or at the best in the condition of heated debate. We have now to consider these two opposing elements in the reciprocal position of consultation, for mutual advantage. The value of conciliation, as applied to trade disputes, is almost beyond debate, except in so far as it relates to the method, and to the constitution of the board. Under the present conditions of the "labour market," and the circumstances attending the employment of large numbers of workmen by a single employer, firm, or company, conciliation is a duty which both parties owe to each other, and also to the State, which accords them its protection. It is obviously to their own interest and to the advantage of the public, that differences and difficulties affecting labour should be settled in an amicable manner; instead of which the disputants are generally found standing, arms akimbo, ready for a fight. There must always be two parties to a quarrel, and each thinks himself right. They commence by showing a bold front, defiance is the next step, then follows an open rupture. In disputes of this kind certain obstacles have necessarily to be overcome; but they are often fanciful, sometimes insignificant, always exaggerated, on both sides. The chief are: (1) The refusal of employers to

recognise the officers of the trade union, and meet them as agents of the men. As well may the men object to meet the foreman, overlooker, or secretary of an employers' association. (2) Some employers seem to regard sitting at the same table and talking over the rate of wages, hours of labour, and other matters, as being beneath their dignity, and as conceding too much. This, after all, is a mistaken policy, quite unworthy of the majority of employers, who are usually sensible, well-informed, and tolerably educated men. (3) The workmen are equally to blame, for they quite as frequently refuse to make the slightest advance towards a conciliatory course. They will look askance at every effort to interpose, however well intended, and mediation would more often be resented, were it not for the wider experience of the leaders. And yet the men will look at the daily papers in the hope of seeing the smallest concession, and will almost pray for an indication of giving way; but they resolutely refuse to take the first step, and seldom offer the least facility for any mutual arrangement. This is very stupid; it originates in a prejudice against compromise, which, after all, is the basis of every settlement.

§ 2. The attitude assumed by the disputants closely resembles, and is quite as absurd as, that of two boys quarrelling and threatening each other, both of whom are unwilling to give in, and are yet afraid to strike the first blow—each hoping that the other will yield, and thereby avoid the necessity for a contest. There is on either side a false pride and foolish obstinacy. Neither party likes to be told so, nor will they admit its truth; nevertheless these disputes are usually the result of a headstrong policy, arising from a lack of knowledge, and of common courtesy in matters in which both have an equal interest. Such blunders will, it is hoped, gradually disappear with the spread of education, and the growth of a better feeling between employers and employed. This is the true remedy. By this alone can the hostility which now exists be eradicated. The whole question lies in a nutshell—Is brute force better than reason? If it be, then a costermonger may be a greater personage than a philosopher, and Tom Sayers might have been considered superior to John Stuart Mill! If any

man were ignorant enough to believe this, it would require considerable hardihood on his part to propound it in public, and still more so to defend his theory. To such an absurdity can some labour disputes be reduced. The measure of folly to be allotted to either party, must depend on his or their conduct, under the particular circumstances.

§ 3. Workmen and employers appear to stand, in their relationship to each other, in a very different position, to mere sellers and buyers of commodities. These will bargain and barter, and try to arrange their differences without anger, or the assumption of any undue superiority on either side. A modification here, and a concession there, will often reconcile the apparent diversity of views, and seeming antagonism of interests. So it might frequently be in labour disputes, if the whole of the facts were carefully considered. Much of the misery caused by strikes and lock-outs could be avoided, by a little moderation and concession at the outset. And society has a right to demand that these kinds of civil strife and social warfare shall be prevented whenever possible. The public may not at all times be in a position to decide between the contending parties; but it has the right, and the power, to deprecate an appeal to material forces which may endanger its peace, and bring ruin on those who are in no way responsible for the struggle. A simple dispute between the buyer and seller of ordinary wares has little interest for the general public. If any such occur, there are easy modes of settlement; and even if litigation should be finally resorted to, the law has the means of deciding the several issues raised. In labour contests this is often not possible. Some other method has therefore to be found; and the most natural way, especially in the earlier stages, is by conciliation. The lesson to be impressed on the minds of employers and employed is, that it is their bounden duty to consider courteously and fairly each other's claims, and to try to effect an arrangement which will avert an open rupture. Instead of this, a dispute generally assumes the character of a contention; one party dictates conditions, the other tries to evade them, until either is reduced to sue for terms. The latter condition can only arise after the contest has passed its first stage, and hostilities have

actually begun. It is, however, far better to avoid such an issue.

§ 4. The earlier legislative attempts to establish Courts of Conciliation in this country were promoted by the representatives of the workmen, under the auspices of the National Association of United Trades. Mr. Mackinnon took charge of the Bill with this view, and steered it safely through parliament. Lord St. Leonards subsequently tried to give these courts a more popular form, and invest them with more direct legal powers. In this he was assisted by some of the trade union leaders of the metropolis. Hitherto legalised courts have been, if not altogether fruitless, at least totally inadequate for the purposes for which they were designed. The fault lies, not in the measures, or the system; it arises from a disregard of the objects which their promoters had in view, and the provisions made for their attainment. Voluntary they must ever be, except in so far as the pressure of public opinion may be made to operate in a sufficiently powerful manner to morally enforce their adoption, and also any decision at which they may arrive, after due consideration of all the facts and their modifying circumstances. It is, however, next to impossible to establish permanently Courts of Conciliation, and effect any real good by them, until the workmen's representatives are not only fully recognised, but even welcomed by the employers. They constitute the legitimate medium for the discussion of the several matters in dispute, and for trying to effect a settlement. If the leaders are sometimes wrong-headed, they are amenable to reason, and are open-minded enough to consider facts, even when they tell against them; and moreover they have the pluck generally to maintain their ground before those who empower them to negotiate terms, even when those agreed upon are not equal to their expectations, or it may be are opposed to their demands.

§ 5. During the last few years a great change has taken place in the tone and temper of employers with respect to conciliation. Formerly they were much opposed to the general principle, on the grounds that it involved a scrutiny into their private affairs, the mode in which they conducted their business, and into questions of cost and profits, with which the men had

no concern. Some experimental trials of a scheme of conciliation, in connection with the Nottingham Lace and Hosiery trades, and with the Iron trades of the North of England, had the effect of removing some of the prejudices which had existed. Further trials of the system took place in connection with coal-mining, the basis of which was a sliding scale, somewhat resembling that in operation in the iron trade. These were but experiments, designed to take the place of what might be termed the irregular method of negotiation, resorted to when a difficulty had already arisen in a particular industry, or branch of trade. They were tentative in character and method, but they served to show that conciliation was possible, on a tolerably wide scale, if the employers and the workmen would only agree to reason together on fairly equal terms. The first difficulty had been overcome, that of employers meeting the representatives of the men. The contact of the two parties did not produce further cleavage or disseverance, but tended more and more to mutual cohesion and respect, the effects of which have been growing and extending for some years, in all parts of the country.

§ 6. Generally speaking, a strike does not settle a labour difficulty, although it often leads to a settlement. The final stage of a dispute is usually some kind of conference between the two parties, whereat terms are arranged and agreed upon. These conferences have been termed irregular modes of conciliation, resorted to when one or both of the forces had expended their energies in a conflict, and were prepared for some arrangement which should end the strife. Such improvised conferences scarcely warrant their being designated as modes of conciliation, because the mischief had been done, the evil had been wrought, the basis of industrial peace had only to be ratified. But even these negotiations often had the effect of preventing what might be termed social after-damp, which is almost as destructive as the explosion. Some of the worst evils of industrial warfare have arisen from reprisals after the conflict is over. The men who have taken part in it were persecuted in a merciless manner, work was refused to them, they were starved out of house and home. No more cruel persecution could be perpetrated, for often the men who thus suffered were by no means

the cause of the contest. Not infrequently they were even opposed to it. But a scapegoat had to be found and sacrificed, as "an example to others." Much of this was prevented by a conference, however elementary in its character it may have been. Friction was thus prevented after the event, and predisposing causes to future complications were removed. In nearly every case some easement was effected by these conferences, and in some cases they took place early enough to minimise the evils of a strike.

§ 7. The institution of the North of England Board of Conciliation and Arbitration for the Manufactured Iron Trade was a considerable step towards conciliation. The disputes in that trade had been frequent, bitter, and often exceedingly riotous. It was nothing unusual to hear of soldiers being drafted into the disaffected districts, during or pending a strike. There were also difficulties of no mean kind in the very nature of the employment, in consequence of alterations in the modes of manufacture or work, the fluctuations in price, and numerous other incidental matters. From 1869, the year in which the Board was established, to 1886, there were no fewer than thirty distinct and separate wages settlements by awards of arbitrators, mutual arrangements, or sliding scale agreements; in some cases there were advances in wages, in others reductions, but the loyalty on both sides has kept the Board in existence down to the present time. But the thirty chief settlements above alluded to form only a fraction of the number of disputes actually disposed of by the Board; it had adjusted some 800 disputes, of one kind and another, in a period of seventeen years, and many more must have been prevented. In the whole of the 800 disputes only about a score had to be referred to arbitration, apart from the decisions of the Board consisting of representatives of the ironmasters and the ironworkers. The history of the work of the Board of Conciliation and Arbitration of the North of England Manufactured Iron Trade is replete with interest to all sorts and conditions of men, as showing that industrial war can be prevented to a large extent, and that a common ground can be formed for the discussion and settlement of trade disputes.

§ 8. The sliding scale arrangements began to operate in 1871, and have been in operation ever since, in connection with the Iron and Steel trades, and also more or less in connection with coal-mining, since 1871 or 1872. These sliding scales are based upon a common rate, the advances or reductions, as the case may be, being regulated by the prices realised according to the standard, at so much per cent., or so much per day, and sometimes with a premium, or bonus, of so much per ton, as in the Midland Wages' Board arrangement. This sliding scale system has had its vicissitudes, but on the whole it has weathered the storm fairly well in most cases. If the Conciliation Board is unable to agree, the matter is referred to an Arbitrator, but this necessity does not often arise in proportion to the whole number of cases before the Board. The number of disputes even under the sliding scale is considerable, as is shown by the record of the Durham Joint Committee. In 1881 there were 390; in 1882, the number was 493; in 1883, it was 562; in 1884, it was 629. Of these only about 122 were referred in one way and another, but 30 of them were not really sent for arbitration. In the Northumberland Coal trade, some 3,000 disputes have been settled by the Joint Committees, without any serious disturbance to the trade of the districts affected. A sliding scale arrangement has been recently established in South Wales, covering the whole of the colliery districts. In other parts of the country, and in other branches of industry, they are also in operation, and generally speaking they have usually been supported by the more thoughtful of the workmen.

§ 9. In the more recent disputes, the modes of settlement have been of the irregular kind, after the event, rather than by a Board in existence with authority to deal with the several matters as they arise. The Dockers' strike in 1889 was really settled by arbitration, after efforts to effect a settlement by conciliation had failed. Those efforts, however, paved a way for a settlement, if they did not altogether succeed in their design and purpose. The dispute, however, did something more—it led to a wider and deeper interest being taken in the subject of conciliation as a means of averting strikes, and settling disputes. It was the chief predisposing cause of the institution of a

Conciliation Committee, by the London Chamber of Commerce, the establishment of which may be of permanent advantage to the industrial world.

§ 10. The great strike of the miners in the early part of the present year, was settled after a few days' cessation of work, by a joint committee composed of representatives of the Coal-owners' National Federation, and of the National Federation of Miners. The conferences of these two bodies led to something further, for it was agreed that before handing in their notices in future, the miners' local association should confer with the local employers' association, and, if deemed necessary, that the National Federation of Miners should meet the National Federation of Employers, to see whether some amicable arrangement could be arrived at before determining on a strike. No definite basis was agreed upon, but the mere fact of this arrangement being made will have the effect of averting great strikes in most instances.

§ 11. The most considerable and important step yet taken towards instituting an organised system for the prevention of trades' disputes conciliation, is the scheme formulated by the London Chamber of Commerce. It was practically the outcome of the Dockers' strike. It was prepared by able and competent men, in consultation with employers, representatives of labour, and public men of varied experience, and differing views, all of whom were agreed that it was worth while to make an effort to prevent strife wherever practicable. The Committee first of all collected information; they then drafted a scheme which was discussed and adopted by the Council on the 12th of December, 1889. The draft was submitted to a number of persons, and afterwards published as an interim report. The scheme, as finally revised and put forward by the London Chamber of Commerce, is of such a character that it deserves to be given *in extenso*. Whether it is possible for any central Board, representing divers trades, with interests by no means identical, to command the confidence of all those trades, for such period as to be able to ensure their continued adhesion to the scheme, is a matter upon which there may be, and is, a strong divergence of opinion; but the fairness of the proposals entitles them to

respectful consideration, even from those who may disagree with the means, as set forth in the following report:

§ 12. The Conciliation Scheme of the London Chamber of Commerce, as embodied in the Further Report of the Labour Conciliation Committee to the Council of the London Chamber of Commerce is given as follows:

Your committee has endeavoured to devise some practical methods for carrying out the scheme contained in the interim report provisionally adopted by the council on the 12th of December, 1889.

The committee offers the following suggestions:

I. That a permanent body be constituted, to be called "The London Conciliation Board," which shall be affiliated to the London Chamber of Commerce, and that its composition shall be as follows, viz.:

(*a*) Twelve members representing capital or employers, to be elected by the council of the Chamber.

(*b*) Twelve members representing labour, to be elected by the employed.

(*c*) To these shall be added representatives from the separate Trade Conciliation Committees as hereinafter referred to.

(*d*) The body thus constituted shall add to their number six other members, who from their position, authority, or experience may be useful in promoting the objects of the London Conciliation Board; three to be appointed by the labour representatives on the Board, and three by the representatives of capital.

(*e*) Four members, viz., the Lord Mayor of London, or some member of the Corporation to be nominated by him; the chairman of the London County Council, or some member of the Council to be nominated by him; a representative of the London Trades' Council, and a representative of a London labour organisation to be selected by the labour representatives on the Board.

The elections shall take place every three years, and the first election shall take place on a date to be fixed.

II. The duties of the London Conciliation Board shall be as follows:

(*a*) To promote amicable methods of settling labour disputes and the prevention of strikes and lock-outs generally, and also especially in the following methods:

1. They shall, in the first instance, invite both parties to the dispute to a friendly conference with each other, offering the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce as a convenient place of

meeting. Members of the committee can be present at this conference, or otherwise, at the pleasure of the disputants.

2. In the event of the disputants not being able to arrive at a settlement between themselves, they shall be invited to lay their respective cases before the committee, with a view to receiving their advice, mediation, or assistance. Or, should the disputants prefer it, the committee would assist them in selecting arbitrators to whom the questions at issue might be submitted for decision.

3. The utmost efforts of the committee shall, in the meantime and in all cases, be exerted to prevent, if possible, the occurrence or continuance of a strike or lock-out until after all attempts at conciliation shall have been exhausted.

The London Conciliation Board shall not constitute itself a body of arbitrators except at the express desire of both parties to a dispute, to be signified in writing, but shall in preference, should other methods of conciliation fail, offer to assist the disputants in the selection of arbitrators chosen either from its own body or otherwise. Any dispute coming before the Board shall, in the first instance, be referred to a conciliation committee of the particular trade to which the disputants belong, should such a committee have been formed and affiliated to the Chamber.

(*b*) To collect information as to the wages paid and other conditions of labour prevailing in other places where trades or industries similar to those of London are carried on, and especially as regards localities either in the United Kingdom or abroad where there is competition with the trade of London. Such information shall be especially placed at the disposal of any disputants who may seek the assistance of the London Conciliation Board.

III. The separate Trade Conciliation Committees shall be composed of equal numbers of employers and of employed.

Each trade shall elect its own representatives, employers and employed voting separately for the election of their respective representatives. The number of members and the general rules of procedure shall be determined by each particular trade, subject to the approval of the London Conciliation Board.

The Trade Conciliation Committees shall be affiliated to the London Chamber of Commerce, and shall be represented upon the London Conciliation Board. Any Trade Conciliation Committee constituted as above, representing a body or trade in the metropolitan districts of more than 1,000 individuals, shall send two representatives to sit on the London Conciliation Board, one being an employer, and the other an operative workman, each to be separately elected by employers and employed respectively.

In the case of Trade Conciliation Committees representing bodies or trades in the metropolitan districts smaller in number than 1,000 individuals, two or more such committees may unite together to elect joint representatives to the London Conciliation Board.

It shall be the duty of the Trade Conciliation Committees to discuss matters of contention in their respective trades; to endeavour amicably to arrange the same, and in general to promote the interests of their trade by discussion and mutual agreement. In the event of their not being able to arrange any particular dispute, they will refer the same to the London Conciliation Board, and in the meantime use their most strenuous endeavours to prevent any strike or lock-out until after the London Conciliation Board shall have exhausted all reasonable means of settlement.

They may from time to time consider and report to the London Conciliation Board upon any matter affecting the interests of their particular trade upon which it may be thought desirable to employ the action or influence of the London Chamber of Commerce as a body.

IV. The London Chamber of Commerce places its rooms at the disposition of the London Conciliation Board and of the Trade Conciliation Committees for holding their meetings. Any alterations in the rules and regulations of these bodies which may be from time to time proposed shall be submitted for approval to the council of the Chamber.

V. The above regulations shall be subject to bye-laws to be specially framed for the purpose, and which shall be open to amendment as required from time to time, on agreement between the council of the Chamber of Commerce and the London Conciliation Board.

§ 13. Accompanying the scheme, the following circular was issued, explanatory of the objects which the Committee had in view, and the attitude of the Chamber in respect of the scheme:

The council has had particularly in view the necessity of giving capital and labour an equal representation, and equal voting power in the organisation of the proposed London Conciliation Board and Committees.

Attention is specially called to the fact that this Board will not in itself be primarily or of necessity an arbitrating body, but its main object will be to bring the interested parties together for purposes of discussion and explanation at the earliest stage of any difficulty, with the view of preventing that difficulty

reaching the acute stage of strike or lock-out, arbitration being only suggested in the last resort. It is hoped that the existence of a permanent Board composed of experienced and influential representatives of both capital and labour, to whom any difficulty arising in the labour market can be referred for discussion and consideration at an early period, may, by intervention in a friendly and disinterested manner, enable points of difference to be settled by mutual consent without any stoppage of trade. Should the difficulty, however, prove to be acute, or not one of a nature for settlement on general grounds, the Board will have powers to assist the disputants in nominating special arbitrators. One very important function of the Board will be to assist in promoting the formation of separate Trade Conciliation Committees for the various industries carried on in the metropolis, to whom all disputes affecting those particular industries will in the first instance be referred.

§ 14. The committee, whose names are attached to the scheme and circular, included Cardinal Manning, Sir Henry Isaacs (the Lord Mayor of London), Sir James Whitehead, Bart. (ex-Lord Mayor), Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., Sir Albert Rollitt, M.P., Sir Vincent Kennett-Barrington, Mr. R. K. Causton, M.P., Mr. Samuel Montagu, M.P., Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster, Mr. G. H. Carbett, Mr. S. B. Boulton (the President of the London Chamber of Commerce), and the secretary, Mr. Kenric B. Murray. At subsequent meetings and conferences the trades of London were grouped under twelve general heads for the purposes of representation, consisting of (1) Building Trades, (2) Cabinet and Furnishing Trades, (3) Carmen, Coachmen, 'Bus and Tram Employés, (4) Clerks, Shop-assistants, and Warehousemen, (5) Clothing Trades, (6) Gas, Coal, and Chemical Trades, (7) Leather Trades, (8) Metal Trades, (9) Printing and Paper Trades, (10) Provision and Food Trades, (11) Railway Employés, (12) Shipping Trades. In working out the scheme some practical difficulties may and will arise in connection with the above grouping; but the arrangement is perhaps as good as it could be for initial purposes. Employers will find less difficulty in selecting representatives than the operatives, for various reasons. The scheme deserves attention because of the endeavour to make it honestly representative, it being in no sense a fussy institution for interfering between employers

and employed. Its first effort at conciliation was successful, between the barge-owners, and the bargemen and others; and the spirit of fairness which has hitherto characterised all the proceedings of the committee argues well for the future, and renders the London Conciliation Board a body worthy of the respect and confidence of the trades of the metropolis, in so far as it might be possible for any general Board to undertake negotiations of this nature. There is, however, a strong prejudice against any Conciliation Board which goes beyond a particular industry, or at most the cognate branches which may be affected by any disputes.

II.—BOARDS OF ARBITRATION.

§ 15. These require to be very different in their constitution and powers to Boards of Conciliation. They imply that a dispute has gone beyond its first stage, and that the several matters cannot be mutually arranged—that, in fact, there is a need for submitting all the circumstances of the case to the calmer consideration of cooler heads than those engaged in the contest. It can scarcely be said that the same moral obligations exist in reference to arbitration, as those urged with regard to conciliation; still the reasons that may be assigned in favour of the former course are no less weighty than those which apply to the latter. In both cases the object is the same—namely, to avoid, if possible, an industrial war, a conflict of elements, which are disastrous to all concerned. It would sometimes appear as though both parties took a positive delight in trying to ruin each other. The employers gloat over the sufferings of the men, the smallness of their pay, their empty exchequer, and the poverty and misery which is being endured; the men exhibit equal joy in the prospect of seeing the employers in the Bankruptcy Court, their creditors impoverished, their social station compromised, and their families reduced from affluence to comparative poverty, or at least to a meaner position in society than that to which they had been accustomed. All this is very dreadful; it betrays an utter disregard of social rights and duties, and an indifference to those moral and religious

feelings which, it is the boast of our civilisation, have been developed by a higher culture, and a nobler standard of life. Ample evidence is afforded by each new labour struggle that very frequently fine sentiments are simply employed for the purpose of pointing out the wickedness of those on the other side.

§ 16. The province of conciliation is to remove the causes of discontent and prevent strife; arbitration comes in when dissension has taken place, either through the failure of conciliation, or because it was not adopted as a means of prevention. The constitution of the board appears to be one of the greatest difficulties; but, surely, this is not insuperable. If it be not possible to elect a Board of Arbitration in each town or district, armed with the necessary powers to be able to deal with disputes in every trade, there is no substantial reason why a Board should not be constituted to deal with special questions as they arise, whose decision shall be accepted as final and binding, in so far as that individual case is concerned. This may be a clumsy and a tedious way, still it is less objectionable than resorting to strikes and lock-outs on every occasion, without even an attempt being made to avoid them. Undoubtedly those are best able to deal with the merits of the case who are directly concerned, but an umpire or referee should be elected, free from passions engendered by the strife, in whom all have confidence, to whose judgment the whole of the points can be referred, and whose decision must be accepted in good faith, and be carried out in all honesty. As a rule, the fewer the representatives on such a board, the more likely is it to arrive at a just and sound conclusion. If it be true that in the multitude of counsellors there is safety, it is also true that there is a danger of dissension, and the advantages of the former do not always counterbalance the disadvantages of the latter.

§ 17. When the election of a Board of Arbitration has been resolved upon, it is important that the workmen should select their ablest officers, or leaders, for the position of trust, and when appointed they must place the most implicit reliance on their honour and ability, and repose absolute confidence on their judgment, tact, and honesty, to do the best they can for their con-

stituents. Employers seldom or never disagree with their representatives, whatever the decision may be; workmen often do. Hence repudiations have arisen, after an award has been given, of which so much is sometimes made. But if employers do not repudiate, they frequently evade, which is equally dishonourable. It is worse than useless to go to a Board of Arbitration unless both parties agree to be bound by the award, and are prepared to act upon it in good faith. As a matter of honour, this should always be done, however unsatisfactory the result may appear to be at the time, or unwelcome to those against whom the award has been made. If another tribunal existed, to whom the case could be referred, as in judicial decisions, it would be altogether different, inasmuch as it could then be carried to the higher court; but as this is impossible, the terms and conditions fixed by the arbitrator should be accepted, and acted upon, until the period for which it is binding has expired.

§ 18. Suspicion and prejudice are the two great obstacles to be overcome. These removed, many of the causes of disputes could be explained away, and the misunderstanding itself would be arranged and settled. Employers are not more to blame than the men for the non-success, or rather partial success, of arbitration. The laws relating to both of these modes of dealing with labour disputes were promoted by the leaders and officers of trade unions, by whose energy and perseverance they were carried through parliament. The employers did little towards assisting to pass those measures. On the other hand, the workmen generally have done literally nothing in the way of putting them in operation, or even in encouraging their officers to take the necessary steps in order to do so. The suspicion of some men amounts almost to an aberration. Cases have occurred in which they have accused the arbitrator of having sold them. In one instance this was urged because, so it was alleged, he had gone to the house of one of the employers, and had dined with him. This, it appears, was not true; but if it had been he would not have been influenced by any such circumstance, or indeed by anything that might have been said at the dinner-table, or over a cigar afterwards. True arbitration can never be realised so long as this suspicion continues. During the past few years

there has been a growth of mutual confidence; prejudices and suspicions are gradually giving place to a higher and better appreciation of the conduct and motives of those engaged in labour struggles, and of those also who attempt a peaceful solution in cases of strife.

§ 19. One great difficulty in the way of successful arbitration is the entire absence of any definite principles, which may serve as a basis upon which awards may be founded. Certain temporary expedients are from time to time resorted to, and these are considered sufficient for the dispute then pending. Sometimes the decisions given have the effect of inaugurating a system, as for example that of the sliding scale, by which prices and rates of wages can be adjusted in such a manner as to prevent any serious misunderstanding for several years. This was the case in the hosiery and lace trades. In the iron trades it has worked tolerably well for twenty-one years, and no serious defections have occurred. It has also been tried in the mining industries, and the experiment has been fairly if not quite permanently successful. It was the best mode that could be adopted under the circumstances, and therefore commendable as a beginning, even if it does not offer the best permanent solution for the labour difficulty. The error seems to be in making wages dependent on the fluctuations of market prices instead of prices being calculated on the basis of wages. Economic and commercial facts and reasons are alone considered in the former case, whereas moral and social grounds ought to have their due weight and influence. Good and substantial reasons might be urged against suddenly raising the wages of the great body of the agricultural labourers from 9*s.* or 10*s.* to 20*s.* per week, but no earthly justification can be given for maintaining the beggarly pittance of 10*s.* per week, with a dole out of the rates in winter to make up for the starvation prices paid by the British farmer. The name of economic science has been used to bolster up all kinds of abominations, and never with greater effect than in the case of the agricultural labourer, and the factory worker; legislation has helped the latter; trade unionism has done something for the former of these two classes.

§ 20. The employers and workmen in each trade and locality,

are the best judges as to what should be the basis of computation in particular cases, and also as to the principles which should regulate the standards of work, and methods of working, according to the specialities of the trade. Wages, and the hours of labour, are cardinal points, involving questions not of detail, but of principle; upon these the contending parties may hold views so diametrically opposed to each other, as would, unless settled by arbitration, inevitably lead to a strike on the one side, or a lock-out on the other. Almost every other question can be adjusted by conciliation, and a dispute might be averted by submitting it to arbitration.

§ 21. That there is a tendency towards a better feeling, even when a strike has taken place, is evident from a variety of circumstances. Some of the old bitterness is disappearing; there is less acrimony, and more good temper displayed than formerly. The following incident occurred not long since in Lancashire. A dispute had arisen with regard to wages, a strike being the result. One of the leading manufacturers having to close his mill like the rest, called his workpeople together, and, in words to this effect, said: "Well, we have a dispute about wages, but that is no reason why we should be bad friends. Let your first day be a holiday, and I will bear the expense." Accordingly he paid their fares to a popular watering-place, and gave each a certain amount for expenses. Other millowners employed their female workers in cleaning the mills, and such portions of the machinery as they could manage to undertake. Conduct like this will not be forgotten by the workpeople, in subsequent dealings with the employers; it will tend to soften the asperities which too frequently accompany labour disputes.

§ 22. Mr. Henry Crompton, in his work entitled "Industrial Conciliation," has discussed every phase of this question so ably and so well that it is unnecessary to deal further with it here. The only other point to be urged is, that employers will act wisely in not increasing the difficulty of applying conciliation or arbitration, as a means of possible prevention or of settlement, whenever there is a chance of doing so. The blame is constantly thrown on the officials of the union, if a strike takes place; whereas Mr. Crompton, and others, have furnished

ample evidence in proof of the fact, that these officials usually offer the strongest resistance, because they know, better than the rank and file of the union, the difficulties and dangers which attend such a step. They are also in a position to judge as to the opportuneness, or otherwise, of the movement; they are acquainted with the state of trade in the several districts; they know what available funds are in hand, and can therefore estimate the probabilities of success. This does not at all times appear, because when a strike is inevitable, or has actually commenced, they are always in the fore-front, even when, as not unfrequently happens, they have opposed it, and would have averted it if they could. An officer in Her Majesty's service may deprecate war; he might even think a particular war an unholy war, but duty calls him to the battle-field, and he goes and fights for his queen and country. So with the leaders of the unions; it is their duty to conduct the affairs of their society, as best they can under the existing conditions, whatever these may be, especially when a vote of the body has been taken, and a certain course has been decided upon. The majority rule, and the minority submit, as in all well-regulated organisations must be the case, or society itself would fall to pieces, by reason of its weakness, caused by dissension, lack of discipline, and want of cohesiveness. Certainly there are exceptions to the rule, as above described; some trade union officers, knowing that the blame will, in any case, fall on their shoulders, prefer to remain neutral, and let matters take their course. Not having the moral courage to oppose the majority, they float with the stream, taking their share of praise, or censure, according to the success or failure of the strike. Nor can this be wondered at, when it is remembered that they have usually to bear the abuse of employers and of the press, and, in addition thereto, run the risk of being taunted with having a leaning towards the employers, if they place themselves too much in opposition to their own members. This is no fanciful picture, but true withal, as every man desirous of ascertaining the facts may verify for himself.

§ 23. The growth of a better feeling between employers and employed was noticed and commented upon in the first issue of

this work; the experience of the last dozen years has shown that the improvement was not ephemeral, but that it is a solid, continuous, and permanent growth, in all parts of the country, and in all trades. During the last two years there have been strained relations between capital and labour, and many strikes have taken place; but even where the latter have occurred, very little of the old bitterness has existed, which formerly left its mark for many a day after the struggle was over. Moreover, in numerous instances, concessions have been made in order to avert a strike, the proportion being in excess of that of any former period. All this is an indication of healthful progress, and that, too, at a time when, in some cases, the men's demands have not been put forward, or pressed, in the most courteous manner that could have been devised. Notwithstanding this, employers as a rule have been, and are, more approachable than they were formerly, so that the probabilities are that labour and capital will waste less money in actual social strife and warfare than in the past, and that they will spend more time in consultation and debate. Whether conciliation or arbitration is resorted to, the end will be in some sense attained, and waste, loss, sometimes ruin, always more or less of suffering, which accompany strikes, will be prevented.

§ 24. Sometimes complaints have been made that awards are repudiated, and that therefore arbitration is altogether a farce. Of the total number of awards given during the last twenty years, it is doubtful if half-a-dozen cases could be cited in which there has been any repudiation. Usually there has been a remarkable loyalty, sometimes under trying circumstances. But, even if the men have been somewhat averse to arbitration—are not commercial men almost equally so? Are not statesmen similarly opposed to it as respects international disputes? It is a delicate plant, of slow growth, and requires much watchful care to rear it amid the storm and strife of social discontent and the elements of industrial disturbance. Neither side has shown any real affection for systematic arbitration. This is proven by the fact that an Act which was passed with great trouble in 1872 has never been put in force. In no case has it been even appealed to. In 1875 the Trades Union Congress

passed a resolution calling upon the Parliamentary Committee to take measures to establish self-supporting local Boards, or Councils of Conciliation and Arbitration, in the chief industrial centres of the United Kingdom.* Not one has ever been established under the Act; but these facts do not prove that no progress has been made. The principle is more widely accepted, and public sentiment is more favourable than it was only ten or a dozen years ago. A little pressure, wisely exercised, would perhaps give the necessary impetus to a movement which would practically put an end to strikes and lock-outs.

§ 25. As indicating how widely spread the feeling is in favour of some effective form of conciliation, or peaceable mode of settling labour disputes, a somewhat novel scheme was suggested by Mr. William Mather, Member of Parliament for one of the Divisions of Lancashire, and a large employer of labour. Mr. Mather, in the early part of the present Session, 1890, requested the "Labour Members" to meet him, to talk over the labour question. At the interview he suggested the formation of a "Consultative Committee," consisting of the Labour Members, and an equal number of employers of labour, all being Members of the House of Commons. In order that there should be no pretence that such Committee was formed in the interests of employers, or of its being in any degree adverse to labour, he proposed that the Labour Members should select and nominate the employers of labour on such Committee. So firmly convinced was he that the selection would be fair and honourable in all respects, and that it would be made in the interests of the community, without favour or partiality to either side, that he assured the representatives who met him that in his opinion all employers of labour, whether in the House or out of it, would concur in his proposal. The object of the proposed Consultative Committee would be to undertake, when called upon, to investigate any dispute existing, pending, or probable, and endeavour to arrange a mutual and peaceful solution of the difficulty; or to arbitrate in case of need, if desired to do so. He suggested that this Consultative Committee should not interfere or obtrude themselves in any

* See Howell's "Handy Book of the Labour Laws," cap. xi.

dispute, but that they should be willing and ready to act whenever requested. Mr. Mather further assured those whom he met, that should they resolve to constitute such Committee, he would guarantee that a fund should be provided to meet all requisite expenses, such as clerical work, printing, postages, and other items; and also the necessary travelling expenses to places in the event of a dispute. The contributors to this fund would be quite outside of the employers, or of workmen's unions or associations. These suggestions were discussed at some length, all present agreeing that they were well worthy of careful consideration, and that the proposal, placing as it did such confidence in the representatives of labour, did credit to the large employer of labour who made it. The Labour Members subsequently met to discuss the matter amongst themselves. After a very careful consideration of the suggestion, in all its bearings, they came to the conclusion that there were many and delicate difficulties in the way of its adoption; that possibly their action might be misunderstood, and that their right thus to constitute themselves into a committee might be questioned. Under these circumstances they thought it best not to proceed further in the matter. The establishment of such Consultative Committee, therefore, remains in abeyance, in so far as those consulted are concerned; but they all appreciated the motives and intentions of the proposer, and thanked Mr. Mather for his suggestions. The incident is mentioned as showing the desire to avoid, where practicable, those conflicts which too often occur in connection with the industries of the country.

CHAPTER XII.

LABOUR AND CAPITAL IN ALLIANCE.

I. CO-OPERATION. II. INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIPS, OR PROFIT-SHARING.

I.—CO-OPERATION—DISTRIBUTIVE AND PRODUCTIVE.

§ 1. Of late years a great number of persons have turned their attention to co-operation, and many have arrived at the conclusion that this is the real panacea for all the ills of industrial warfare, inasmuch as it will provide a means whereby the working classes will be able to work out their own redemption. A vast amount of good has been already accomplished by co-operation, and much more will doubtless be effected. Nevertheless it must be self-evident that the whole of the commercial and trading classes will not easily be shouldered out of the way by any such combination, however rapid its strides may be, or powerful, by reason of its extent or its wealth. Moreover, there is another obstacle to its universal adoption, namely, that the working classes in the mass are not, and will not, for generations yet to come, be prepared to work out the problem, and apply the principle. Professor Fawcett once said: "Co-operation cannot succeed without calling forth many of the highest qualities of man's intellectual and moral nature." These can only be developed gradually, and therefore co-operation has been and will be of slow growth, notwithstanding the great progress made during the past thirty-five years. Hitherto it has chiefly been confined to distribution, where it has achieved enormous success; but the advocates of the movement strongly

deprecate its being so confined, and urge the adoption of the principle of associative labour in production as well as in distribution.

§ 2. Mr. Holyoake, in his "History of Co-operation," says: "Co-operation, in the social sense of the word, is a new power of industry, constituted by the equitable combination of the worker, capitalist, and consumer, and a new means of commercial morality, by which honesty is rendered reproductive." This is the poetical description of it; the sounder commercial view is stated as follows: "It is the concert of many for compassing advantages impossible to be reached by one, in order that the gain made may be fairly shared by all concerned in its attainment." In this truer sense, co-operation is as yet in its infancy; there are thousands of ways in which it might be applied with advantage, but it requires faith, trustfulness, honest labour, and the capacity to wait with patience for the results. In a great number of instances where co-operation has been successfully tried the higher aims have been abandoned, and these co-operative societies have changed into mere trading companies, with little of their original features left, and absolutely nothing of a tangible character to distinguish them from other joint-stock companies, except the name. The attempts to establish co-operative production by associative labour, on the principle of a division of profits amongst those who find the capital and those who work, may be considered under three heads:

§ 3. (*a*) Co-operation, as applied to distribution, is the purchase of goods wholesale, or in bulk, by the employment of the subscribed capital of the members; these goods are then sold in small quantities to suit the purchaser; in other words, they are retailed over the counter at such prices as will yield a profit on the capital invested, and at the same time give a good and pure article to the members, at the cheapest rate consistent with the safety of the concern, often very much cheaper than the rates charged at the ordinary retail establishments. This was the principle upon which the earlier pioneers in the movement acted, and which was for a long time adopted by most of the co-operative stores. The plan of selling cheaper was after a time nearly abandoned, the prices charged being fixed at the

same, or nearly similar rates to those in other establishments, a portion of the profits realised being carried to the account of the purchaser to the end of the quarter, when a dividend was declared on capital, and a bonus was given to purchasers in proportion to their purchases at the store. The great inducement in this case was the excellence of the goods offered for sale, especially as the prices charged did not exceed those demanded at other shops for inferior articles. The bonus declared was often a considerable sum, considering the smallness of the orders from week to week by each individual customer. But this motive did not act so powerfully at first as was expected, for many preferred a reduction on each article, rather than wait for a bonus three months hence. In process of time the element of capital began to preponderate, and the race for profits affected most of those societies precisely in the same way, and nearly as much, as it had previously operated upon traders whom the co-operative societies were intended to supplant. The chief thing often heard at a co-operative meeting or store is the "divy" the committee are able to announce on the quarter's sales and purchases.

§ 4. This is all very well so far as it goes; it reflects great credit on the management, and is at the same time very beneficial to the members. But in what does it differ from an ordinary trading firm, except that a greater number are participators in the results? Of course this in itself is a most important matter, for if the profits are divided amongst a thousand instead of ten, the nine hundred and ninety will be all the richer in proportion to the amount which falls to their share, although the favoured ten will be less rich by having a thousandth part each instead of a tenth. This is the one great value of co-operation in the estimation of the sociologist, for society is benefited according to the greater number who share in its progress and advantages.

§ 5. The chief merits of co-operative stores over retail traders are: (1) They supply better articles than those supplied by retail shops at prices which, if not actually much lower, are certainly not dearer than those charged by the usual retail establishments. (2) After appropriating certain interest to

capital, the surplus profits are divided amongst the members and purchasers, in proportion to the amount laid out by them at the store during each quarter. (3) They assist in training the whole of their members in the practice of economy, and in developing a knowledge of trading which they could not otherwise obtain. (4) So long as they dealt with ordinary retail establishments they would experience the disadvantages arising from high prices for inferior articles, but they would not understand the difficulties of the retail dealer; in the store they learn that even shopkeeping has its drawbacks and responsibilities. (5) To the foregoing might be added another advantage, namely, that the percentage allowed to capital is frequently limited to a definite amount; but this practice is not universal.

§ 6. The wealth and trading capacity of some of the co-operative stores show that the men who conduct them are second to none in the commercial and mercantile world. Their success deserves the greatest commendation, and has contributed to a higher appreciation of the whole working class, to whom they belong. Still these distributive stores have not done much, except indirectly, in the matter of labour contests. They have removed no difficulties, and have afforded little aid towards any kind of solution of the labour problem. They have, however, developed a new power, have exemplified self-reliance, and added very much to the prosperity of those who have joined such societies. The success of the earlier attempts of working men to improve their condition, by co-operation, has produced a host of imitators, even amongst those who used to sneer and laugh at them. There are now huge establishments, under the designation of co-operative societies, for the special benefit of large sections of the middle classes. Not one word of disparagement need be said with regard to these; if they confer advantages on those who founded them, they have doubtless served their purpose, but in this respect they are essentially commercial undertakings.

§ 7. The progress of co-operation during the last thirty years has been marvellous in continuity and in extent. In June, 1862, a list published by the *Co-operative News* showed that the total sales amounted to £2,333,523. At that time there were

276 co-operative societies, with 72,054 members, and a total share capital of £434,100. A corrected list was published in October of the same year, in which it appears that there were 295 societies, with 78,399 members, having a share capital of £352,110, and effecting sales amounting to £2,518,040 annually. By the end of 1862, it was estimated that, including societies which made no returns, the total number of societies was 400; total members, 100,000; share capital, £500,000; loan capital, £70,000; annual trade, £3,000,000; and profits, £200,000. With the exception of the disastrous industrial year, 1879, in which year the progress was slightly checked, the expansion has been continuous, and in some periods marked. The following table will best illustrate the growth of co-operation from that time to the present, in so far as the returns are available:

	Corrected by later Return.	Corrected by Official Returns.		
	1862.	1887.	1888.	1889.
No. of Societies ...	450	1,516	1,462	1,515
No. of Members ...	91,502	967,828	992,428	1,054,996
Share Capital ...	£310,731	£10,344,216	£10,393,394	£11,199,934
Loan Capital ...	£54,452	£2,253,576	£2,247,377	...
Total Sales ...	£2,349,055	£34,483,771	£36,735,045	£40,225,406
Net Profits ...	£166,302	£3,190,309	£3,414,407	£3,775,464
Grants to Education	Nil.	£21,380	£24,006	£24,008

The above bird's-eye view shows that, in the aggregate, immense progress has been, and is being made. The total sales in twenty-seven years had reached the enormous sum of £511,420,637, while the total net profits realised amounted to £43,410,852. This amount has added to the comfort, and contributed to the self-respect of the members of these societies, and to their families dependent upon them.

§ 8. (*b*) Co-operative production is the particular form of co-operation which has been pointed to, as providing the direct means by which the condition of the labouring classes can be ameliorated, by making them their own manufacturers and employers, and dividing the profits, after payment of a moderate interest on capital, amongst those engaged in the manufacture of

the goods or wares, and those whose duty it is to find the purchasers, and effect the sales. If this experiment could be proven to have been thoroughly and completely successful, in the several attempts that have been already made, it would place the whole matter beyond debate. But this much cannot be claimed for it; all that can be said is, that in numerous cases it has succeeded, and in others it has failed, just as in other trading concerns. One thing, however, is certain, namely, that the failure of a co-operative business, whether factory or workshop, in its results is fraught with greater evils than those that attend the collapse of any private firm, for it shakes the confidence of the working people, who are at all times far too suspicious of all new experiments, especially when they are made with their own capital, in the shape of a few pounds which they have been able to invest in them. For this reason many of the advocates of co-operation have hesitated to recommend its application to productive enterprise, and Professor Fawcett urges great caution in attempting to carry out this principle.

§ 9. Several cogent arguments could be offered in support of the view that it is to the interest of the capitalist and commercial classes to favour and encourage all attempts at co-operative production. Every effort made in this direction will assist in determining the rates of wages which workmen are justified in demanding for their labour, more than any other method that can possibly be suggested. Moreover, it will aid materially in applying the theories of political economy to the facts of everyday life, under the best conditions, and in such a way that working men will not be able to avoid the natural conclusions which are legitimately deducible from the experience they have themselves gained, in manufacturing and trading with their own money, and in their own way. In the co-operative workshop and factory, all such questions as piece-work, overtime, hours of labour, rates of wages, and other matters, will receive a practical illustration as to their value and bearing on production and prices, which will produce a beneficial effect on all similar disputed questions, whenever they arise elsewhere. It may be reasonably argued that if co-operative establishments cannot afford to pay the wages demanded by the workmen, it is

scarcely possible that employers, belonging to the capitalist class, whom they regard as their natural enemies, can do so.

§ 10. Again, experiments of this character will teach workmen that there are many difficulties and responsibilities in trading and manufacturing, to which, hitherto, they have been strangers, and which they cannot learn in any other way. They will thus be able to understand some of the troubles and embarrassments with which employers have to contend in carrying on an extensive business, and in finding the means, from week to week, wherewith to pay the wages of the employés, whoever else may have to go without payment. These things are not at all times sufficiently considered, and it is impossible that they should be under the present system, with the loose relationship now existing between employers and employed. The experience thus obtained will furnish an instructive and valuable lesson in political economy, with which the value of those given in the class-books cannot be compared. The logic of facts will exercise an influence on disputes which cannot long be resisted, whether they tell for or against the claims put forward by the workmen, or on their behalf.

§ 11. It must, however, be admitted that co-operative production has not produced the lasting effects on the "burning questions" which agitate the minds of those engaged in labour which were expected. The utmost it has as yet accomplished in this direction is that it has contributed a certain amount of experience, which deserves to be stored up for future use. Its extent may be a matter of dispute, and its significance may be differently interpreted, according to the views entertained by, or the prejudices of the person to whose judgment the matter is submitted. There are two facts which are pregnant with meaning to working men and to sociologists, namely, that many of the co-operative stores have been very chary in investing their funds in the production of the articles which they offer for sale; and trade unions as a rule have refused to invest any portion of their funds in productive industry. Within the last few years a good deal of capital has been invested in cotton-mills, shoe-factories, and other industries by co-operators apart from co-operative societies, and in very many cases these

enterprises have been singularly successful; but vast sums, saved by means of co-operative distribution, have never yet found their way into the exchequer of the productive societies, though they have attempted to solve the industrial problem, by manufacturing their own goods. Hundreds of thousands of pounds belonging to trade unions are now lying in joint stock and other banks, more or less available for the trading classes, which they absolutely refuse to apply towards the manufacture of the very articles which their members, as craftsmen, are engaged in producing. This fact cannot be overlooked, it ought to be stated, let the explanations be what they may. The excuse generally offered is that all their funds are required to be ready for any emergency, that is, payable on demand. There is a great deal of truth in this. It would not be wise nor practicable to lock up the whole of their balance in any concern, however prosperous. But until trade unions utilise some portion of their wealth in the manufacture of articles produced by their own craft, they can only be viewed as temporary expedients for the relief of the pressing necessities of the hour. If only a portion of the £162,460 paid as out-of-work benefit in two years by the Carpenters, Engineers, Ironfounders, and Boiler-makers had been employed in making doors and sashes, engines, boilers, and castings, it would have been so much reproductive capital, and have contributed something, if only in the shape of experience, towards the solution of the labour question. As at present constituted and managed, trade unions live from year to year on their capital, instead of imitating the commercial classes by growing rich out of profits.

§ 12. In the matter of co-operative production, working men, like others, think more of a few failures than they do of many great and significant successes. It will take a whole generation to wipe out the recollection of the collapse of the Ouseburn Engine Works, of one or two disastrous failures in coal-mining enterprise, and of a similar failure in farming. Joint stock companies fail frequently, with ruinous consequences sometimes to all connected with them; but they are soon forgotten. Banks similarly fail, soon to be utterly lost to memory, except to those who have suffered thereby. But the

public seem to take delight not only in recording the failure of a co-operative concern, but in keeping alive the recollection of such failure. To such an extent is this the case that most people seem to be under the impression that co-operative productive enterprise is weak, almost powerless, in the industrial world, and that it counts for nothing, even as a contribution to experience, in relation to labour questions. In a comparative sense of course this is true. Still some of the productive societies are somewhat extensive, and their career has by no means indicated failure. Some of the establishments might be named, by way of example, such as the Agricultural and Horticultural Association, for farm and garden produce; the Airedale Manufacturing Society, for all sorts of textile stuffs; the Eccles Industrial Manufacturing Society, for sheetings, quilts, and toilet articles; the Hebden Bridge Fustian Manufacturing Society, for various kinds of cloths; the Heckmondwike Manufacturing Society, for carpets, blankets, etc.; the Lancashire and Yorkshire Co-operative Productive Society, for flannels, etc.; the Leak Silk Twist Manufacturing Company; the Leicester Elastic Web Manufacturing Society; the Leicester Hosiery Manufacturing Society; the Paisley Manufacturing Society, for shawls, plaids, etc.; the Dudley Nail Manufacturing Society; the Midland Nail Makers' Association; the Dudley Productive Co-operative Society, for galvanised goods, etc., etc.; the Sheffield Co-operative Cutlery Manufacturing Society; and the Rochdale Pioneers' Society, for the manufacture of tobacco, etc. There are also the Leicester and the Heckmondwike Boot and Shoe Works, the Crumpsall Biscuit, etc., Works, the Durham Soap Works, the Co-operative Printing Society, and many others, all of which claim to be successful.

§ 13. The Co-operative Printing Society has recently celebrated its "coming of age," having been established in Manchester about the middle of the year 1869. As a memento of its attaining its majority, the society printed a memorial volume of about 100 pages for distribution at the commemoration meeting of the society's twenty-first anniversary. This volume not only gave a history of the rise and progress of the society, and a programme of the festival, but it was embellished with

numerous portraits and lithographic views illustrative of phases in its history, and the development of its works. This memorial volume showed with what skill, taste, and excellence of workmanship the department was conducted. The balance-sheets of the society, which are published half-yearly, show that in 1869 there were 92 shareholders with £445 share capital, and £222 loan capital, the trade done at the end of the first half-year being £417. At the close of 1889 the total shareholders numbered 536; the share capital was £15,945; the loan capital, £10,606; the reserve fund amounting to £3,919, while its trade turn-over was £27,880, or at the rate of £55,760 per annum. Its total trade had reached £550,914, the wages paid, £131,068; for management, £25,192; its profits had been £34,486; the dividend paid, £18,181, or an average of 8¼ per cent.; its dividend on trade being £2,837, while £3,199 was distributed among the employés as a bonus on wages; besides which it gave away in charitable donations £593. The rate of interest to capital extending over twenty-one years was fairly good for a business concern, especially considering that a large allowance has been made for depreciation, while the stock and buildings were moderately valued.

§ 14. The boot and shoe trade seems to offer greater facilities for co-operative production. At the Leicester Works, started towards the end of 1874, the total production in 1875, the first complete year, was £38,684; in 1888 the total amounted to £139,955. In fifteen years the total production reached £1,340,399; the net profit realised has been £32,982. The average rate on production was £37 15*s.* 6*d.* In only one year was there a loss, the total being £317. The Heckmondwike Boot and Shoe Works show similar progress. Started in 1880, the total production has reached £155,102; the net profits, £1,523, the average rate on production being nearly £37. The total losses amounted to £952 in the first three years, since which no losses have been incurred. The Newcastle branch of the boot and shoe trade produced, in value, from 1877 to 1888 inclusive, £761,454, the profits being £15,027. Examples in this department need not be extended. Among the other productive works might be mentioned the Crumpsall Biscuit

Works, started in 1874, the total production at which had amounted to £307,496 to the end of 1888, the profits being £13,305, the rate on production being £24 1*s.* 11*d.* The majority of the productive societies show some amount of success, but this class of co-operative work does not keep pace with the distributive.

§ 15. At the recent Co-operative Congress, held in Whitsun-week, 1890, a review of co-operative production was one of its features, and some curious items of information may be obtained from the reports. For example, with respect to farming societies, the report states "that they do not deserve the prominence given to them in previous reports." The "Productive Committee" endeavoured to ascertain the extent and the results of co-operative production, for which purpose they sent out a series of questions, by circular, with stamped envelopes for a reply. Out of 1,503 circulars sent out, only 487 replies were received. Of the 487 replies 188 stated that they carried on productive works, 300 did not. To the question, whether they were prepared to give a bonus to labour, 180 out of the 487 replied in the affirmative, while 308 replied in the negative. To the question whether they were prepared to support the Congress resolution for an equitable division of profits between capital, labour, and the consumer, 272 replied in the affirmative, and 192 in the negative. Among the replies were the following: "Cæsar, alas, is not likely to give his fellow-labourers more than the maximum wages of the district, unless there is hope for him, in the near future, of equal treatment." Which means no bonus to labour, as voted by working men for working men. The general view was that a bonus to labour was desirable if labour undertook some of the risks; otherwise workmen get their bonus by purchases from the store. They believe in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, but not in going beyond this. The "Co-operative Wholesale" have decided upon the question of profit-sharing as follows: "Resolved: That the consideration of the advisability of paying a bonus to employés be not entertained." This resolution was passed in June, 1886, and was re-affirmed by letter on January 28th, 1889, and again early in the present year (1890). The Scottish Wholesale, however, is

in favour of paying a bonus to labour. As a final conclusion to the question the Productive Committee say: "In face of the discouraging nature of the replies from societies, any further action would be futile. It is evident that amongst the general body of our members very little interest is taken in this question." An attempt is being made to establish a co-operative chair-making factory, towards which £1,116 of capital have been subscribed, of which £445 were contributed by private individuals, and the remainder by co-operative societies and co-operators. A careful review of all the facts in connection with co-operative production, and of profit-sharing by the various co-operative societies, whether distributive or productive, leads to the conclusion that very little progress, comparatively speaking, has been made towards the solution of the labour question, beyond the fact that further evidence has accumulated, showing that the principle is capable of being worked out successfully, if the workmen display the qualities indicated by the late Mr. Fawcett; but not otherwise on any extensive scale in any department of labour.

II.—INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIPS, OR PROFIT-SHARING.

§ 16. Perhaps the best possible form in which to test some of the questions relating to wages and profits, and of trying to equalise the proportion which should be paid for supervision and for labour, after deducting a fair percentage for the use of the capital employed, is to be found in some method of profit-sharing, or of industrial partnership. In order that the division shall be equitable, and just to all concerned in the undertaking, it is necessary that the value of plant shall be accurately computed, and the actual working capital stated, and the cost of materials made known. The salaries of every person employed, and the wages of every worker, must also be given, so that the net cost of production shall be estimated with precision. On the other side must be placed the proceeds from sales, with such items of expenditure as may have been incurred by transit, exchanges, commission, deductions, abatements, losses, and other matters incidental to trading. These having

been carefully balanced, the net profits should be divided in the proportions agreed upon, when the undertaking was commenced. This is the essential idea of industrial co-partnership, but on this basis it can hardly be said to have had a fair trial. A more elementary form of profit-sharing has been tried, namely, the promise of a bonus, out of profits, at the end of each financial year, according to the salaries or wages of those employed, this being the recognised test of ability. In the latter case the workmen of course have no right of inspection; they must depend on the assurance of the employers, or of those who prepared their financial statement, as to the net profits of the year, and accept the bonus without question, and in all thankfulness.

§ 17. Many experiments have been made with a view of testing the practicability and value of these methods of employment, as a means at once of reducing the cost, and lessening the friction, between the two parties engaged in production. Some of those experiments have been far from encouraging, others have been miserable failures. A few have survived seasons of depression, and the strain they had then to encounter, which, after all, is the crucial test of their soundness and feasibility. When failures occur, each side condemns the other, and it is often very difficult to ascertain the exact cause or causes which have led to the catastrophe. The workmen are usually accused and censured; but it is far from improbable that the employers are altogether free from blame in the matter.

§ 18. In whatever form these efforts to place the workmen in a position to have a direct interest in their labour may be attempted, they cannot fail to produce results more or less beneficial and lasting. When they have something to look forward to, above and beyond their mere wages, the advantages offered are calculated to increase their motives for exertion, and to encourage them to do their best in order to promote the progress and prosperity of the firm. Some establishments have adopted the plan of offering inducements to the more steady and careful of their employés, to invest a portion of their earnings in the business, the amount to bear interest in the same way as it would if invested elsewhere, and in addition

thereto receive a bonus at the end of the year, in proportion to the total amount accumulated in each particular case. This plan has worked well in many instances; it has not, however, become general; and even where it has been tried too few have availed themselves of its obvious advantages. One reason for this may be the obstinacy of the men; they may say: "We have earned our salaries or wages, and we have a right to spend them or save them as we like." Another may be the dislike which many have to let the employer, and also those who are employed in the same firm, know what their accumulated savings are. Whatever the reasons, the fact is indisputable, that the practice is as yet only very partially in operation, either as to its adoption by employers, or its acceptance by those employed. The sole remedy for this is a healthier and more cordial feeling between those who stand in the relationship of employer and employed; instead of which, they are in one sense daily becoming more and more estranged, because the tie which binds them is being limited to "minute contracts," which can be severed at a moment's notice, without warning or regret. To talk about identity of interests under these circumstances, is little more than a farce, a mockery, and an insult.

§ 19. The further efforts to institute some practicable and satisfactory method of profit-sharing have been made in recent years, some of which are declared to be eminently satisfactory. In some instances, attempts to introduce the system have been denounced and resisted. The disastrous strike at the South Metropolitan Gas Works was levelled at the proposals of Mr. Livesey. Without discussing the *pros* and *cons* of that dispute, it might, perhaps, be said that if the proposals had been made at any other time, when no friction existed between the company and their employés, possibly the determination and the results might have been otherwise. Proposals somewhat similar in character were made by Messrs. Peto Brothers, and were accepted by the workmen after some explanations and modifications of the scheme. If such schemes are introduced as a means of interfering with the operations of trade unions, the probability is that they will not succeed. If, on the other hand, a *bonâ fide* attempt is made to increase the workmen's personal

interest in the concern, the chances are that any equitable arrangement will be welcomed. In all such cases the men must feel that the scheme is not merely intended to give greater security to capital, and larger profits to capitalists, but that it is also intended to benefit labour and the labourer. On any other basis the system cannot permanently succeed, and ought not to succeed. Equity and justice demand that the arrangement shall be mutual; then, and then only, will it assist in solving the labour problem by making the interests of workmen and employers identical, in so far as each has a direct and permanent share in the prosperity of the concern.

§ 20. It can scarcely be said that any great scheme of profit-sharing, on the system of the Maison Leclaire, has been fully tried in this country. Partially it has been, and is being tried, but its successful application to British industry is still in its experimental stage. The Maison Leclaire system has been successfully extended in various directions on the Continent of Europe, in Germany, Switzerland, and other countries; but in England the experiments have been, and are, mostly of a tentative character. Professor Sedley Taylor has explained with great clearness the system of Leclaire, and its suitability to British industrial enterprise, and he took pains to ascertain the attitude of the leading English trade unionists to the scheme. There was at that time, 1879–80, and onwards to 1884, no opposition to the principles of the scheme on the part of any leading trade union official, or of any prominent man in the trade union ranks, or known to be specially identified with labour. The opposition which had been shown in one or two instances was against what was regarded as a spurious system introduced by one or two firms as an experiment. A participation in profits ensures to the workmen all that trade unionism strives to attain, provided that the principles upon which that participation is worked out and administered are economically sound and equitable. Mr. Sedley Taylor has correctly stated what the "essential requisite" for the success of the participatory system is: "It consists in mutual confidence between employer and employed. The workmen must feel assured that the chief of a house, in introducing these altered industrial

relations, is not merely led by self-interest, but has their material and moral elevation at heart, and intends to be personally at hand with counsel, suggestion, and active co-operation, in order to secure from the system the full benefits which it has elsewhere been the means of conferring on the working classes. The head of the house, on his side, must be able to rely on the workmen for the zealous, sustained, and concerted efforts, on which the efficacy of the whole system depends." This is the kernel of the whole question. It practically means that to be successful, like the Maison Leclaire, the employer and the employed shall be of a high order in their class; that they shall be actuated by social and moral aims; that self-interest shall be regulated and under control, subordinated, in fact, to the common good of all, on terms mutually advantageous and beneficial to all engaged in the undertaking.

§ 21. The question is have we arrived at a stage in our social and industrial system and history when these principles can be applied with advantage? In exceptional instances, yes; universally, no. And what is called the new trade unionism rather obtrudes obstacles to any successful realisation of the Leclaire system. It seeks to effect by statute, and by municipal law, what can only be effected by mutual arrangement, on equal terms of negotiation. State regulation will make wages slaves, not emancipate them. It has no higher conception than that hiring by the day, week, month, or year, at so much per day, for so many hours, is the normal condition of industry. It perpetuates the very system which the men, in their speeches, condemn. At the very best it could only attain to a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, with the doubtful addition that wages might be levelled down, instead of being levelled up. In productive co-operation at its best, or profit-sharing, on the Leclaire system, wages would be but part appropriation of profits, until the annual balance-sheet was made up, when all would participate in just proportions according to the contribution of each to the joint concern. Capital and labour in alliance will create identity of interests, evoke the highest order of skill, produce the best workmanship, and give to each its rightful dues, by mutual participation in the results of industrial enterprise.

CHAPTER XIII.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES IN THEIR RELATION TO TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. In an article in the *Contemporary Review* of January, 1887, the Rev. W. Walter Edwards stated that "the materials are wanting from which a connected history of the friendly society movement, from its beginning, could be compiled." This is scarcely accurate; the materials are not wanting, they are abundant enough; that which is wanted is the time, the patience, and the means to collect, assort, arrange, and tabulate the mass of facts lying here, there, and everywhere, only awaiting the requisite skill of a painstaking worker and ready writer to be made available for future use. Certain qualifications are, however, absolutely necessary in the person who undertakes such a task; (1) he must have a full and complete knowledge of working men and their movements, in order to see where and how all the diversified particulars, so collected and arranged, appropriately apply; and (2) he must possess capability and aptitude to be able to deal with them in the aggregate, and to deduce therefrom the proper and legitimate conclusions. Mr. Edwards, in his otherwise excellent paper, has committed the capital error of supposing that trade unions are friendly societies in the same sense as the Oddfellows and Foresters, and that in using their funds for strike purposes they are violating the first law of their existence. This is a blunder quite unworthy of a writer whose sympathies on the whole are broad and generous, and whose intentions are unmistakably good, in so far as his information enables him to estimate closely the value of the numerous circumstances which surround and govern those

two favourite forms of association among working men, and to judge aright as to their application. He also appears to be unacquainted with the historical relationship existing between these typical societies, and the causes which led to their development on independent lines in the latter part of the last century.

§ 2. The basis, the primary object, and the government of trade unions differ very materially from those of friendly societies. In the former, the friendly society purposes are secondary and subordinate; in the latter they constitute not only the principal, but the whole design of the institution. Their scope and intention are widely dissimilar, and to confound the one with the other is to mistake an incidental feature for the fundamental principle, and to suppose that the whole is contained in a part, which is physically impossible. The inability to distinguish between the essential nature of trade societies, and the characteristics which have grown up in connection with them, has produced much perplexity in the minds of those who have attempted to discuss their merits, and define their position in the country, as one of the great economical forces which is in constant operation, socially and industrially, in the body politic of the nation. Although it is true that the main objects of these two forms of organisation are not identical, they are by no means antagonistic. There are certain elements which are common to both, but one of them has aims and ends which the other has not, and therefore they should be kept quite distinct and apart when treating of their several functions. The absence of clear and definite views on these points has led to serious errors on the parts of writers and public men, and to demands for legislative interference which, if adopted, would utterly destroy the distinctive character of trade unions, without giving any corresponding advantage to compensate the workmen for the loss which they would sustain, if the unions were emasculated or abolished.

§ 3. It is not necessary to enter into details, either with regard to the history or working of friendly societies. In the following remarks it is intended simply to deal with them in their relation to trade unions, to show how and why they differ, and to point out the difficulties in the way of complete amalga-

mation. As already stated, the early guilds embraced both trade and friendly benefits in much the same way as the better class of trade unions do now, only more restricted. When the guilds declined, or were suppressed, the only legal mode by which the working classes were able to retain the power of organisation was by means of benefit clubs. These ultimately developed into the modern friendly societies. In the transition from the old state of things to the new conditions of industrial life, these societies supplied the link from the earlier trade guilds to the trade unions of the present time. During the intervening period, from 1793 to 1824, combinations of workmen for the protection of labour were illegal, and to the members of such societies were positively dangerous. The benefit society alone was unmolested, so long as it did not extend beyond the town or place where it was established, and did not embrace other objects. If by law the one form of association was not favoured at the expense of the other, by actual statute, at least it did not go out of its way for the purpose of suppressing the one, as was the case with the other.

§ 4. In consequence of this many of the earlier trade unions took the form of benefit societies, as a cloak to cover their chief design. This was not the fault of the men, but rather of the law which had necessitated it. The legislature tried hard and persistently to suppress the free association of workmen for trade purposes, just at the very time when it was most needed. The result was that societies for mutual aid sprang into existence, which had the effect of keeping up constant intercourse with large numbers of men, and provided a means whereby they were able to consult together, and pursue other objects not directly within their province. Not only were such associations a necessity of the times, they are also an important element in human nature, the desire for which cannot possibly be rooted out. But the law-makers were blind to all this; they attempted repression, and the men resorted to the only mode of organisation then possible, namely, the Friendly Society, which, to a limited extent, at least, was permissible. Even this right was, however, but slowly recognised by the State; it was not until the year 1793 that the first Friendly Societies' Act was passed; the

powers given by that Act were very slight, for it only gave permission to appoint committees, which should make rules and impose fines upon members. Certain privileges were, however, granted in addition; they were exempted from the heavy stamp duties of those days; they had the right of summary legal remedies against the officers of such societies, or against members; they had a preferential right against the estates of deceased office-bearers; arbitration was made binding; and they had the power of suing and being sued in their corporate capacity.

§ 5. As the objects of the earlier societies were few and simple, and as they did not meddle in political or polemical matters, they received encouragement from clergymen and others, and even ladies condescended to assist in promoting their development. Not unfrequently the wealthier classes attempted to play off the friendly society, or benefit club, against the trade union; the latter was tabooed, whereas the former was patronised and fostered. Hence they grew rapidly in numbers, and gradually acquired importance and influence in the localities where they were established. In the course of time a demand arose for a recognised legal status, the means of protection for their corporate property, and summary jurisdiction for the punishment of those who tampered with their funds. This led to the enactment of the statute above quoted. The earlier societies were merely local clubs, but so numerous were they in 1802, that "no fewer than 9,672 benefit societies had been returned to parliament." The desire for extending both their influence and the scope of their operations beyond the limits of the town or place which gave them birth, was soon made manifest. But a long time elapsed before the legal right and power to do so was conceded, and even then, and subsequently for fifty years, the branches were obliged to register as independent societies. This anomaly was abandoned in 1849, when affiliated societies were "first put under the protection of the law."

§ 6. In 1854 the Bill of Mr. Sotheron Estcourt was passed. Parliament had then the advantage not only of the experience gained by past legislation and Government inquiries, but also the assistance of men who had devoted much time and attention

to the subject, and whose advice, therefore, was all the more valuable and reliable. It was under this Act that the trade unions obtained what for a long time was considered to be legal protection for their funds, by depositing their rules with the Registrar. The clause giving this supposed protection was submitted to counsel, by whom it was declared to be perfectly satisfactory and sufficient. By a singular coincidence the barrister who was then consulted was Mr. Cockburn, afterwards Lord Chief Justice of England, and he it was who, on January 16th, 1866, decided in the case of Hornby *v.* Close (Court of Queen's Bench) that a trade society did not come within the operation of the Friendly Societies' Act, so as to give the magistrates jurisdiction. This decision dispelled a long-cherished delusion as to the security of the funds of trade unions under that Act, and led to a prolonged agitation in favour of a measure which would accord the protection of the law to their corporate property, just the same as it did in all other cases. After a resistance of nearly seven years by the Government and legislature this was granted by the Trade Union Act, 1871. Meanwhile, in the year 1868, another Act was passed with quite other objects, which, by its subsequent interpretation, applied to trade unions the principle of co-partnerships, but its application was not tested until after the Act of 1871 had been passed.

§ 7. In 1875 all previously existing Friendly Societies' Acts were consolidated and amended. In its original shape the Bill proposed to repeal the Trade Union Act, 1871, and to bring trade societies under the Acts relating to friendly societies. This, however, was opposed by the trade unions, and was subsequently abandoned. The absolute alterations in the law by the Act of 1875 were not numerous, but many of them were important, all of them useful. The consolidation of the Acts was in itself a great boon; and such Acts would be of immensely greater advantage to the members of those societies if they could only be induced to buy the statutes and carefully read them for themselves. It is not too much to say that there is very little in the statute of 1875 which the average newspaper reader could not understand, if he would only set about it in real

earnest; the exercise, moreover, involved in the task, would do him a vast amount of good, mentally and politically.

§ 8. The growth and extent of friendly societies are evident to the most careless observer; their value and importance are attested by the experience of millions of the industrial classes. The total number of societies, registered and unregistered, is stated to be about 32,000; the total number of persons directly interested in them is computed to be over four and a half millions; in addition to which, there are probably over thirteen millions indirectly interested, such as the wives, children, nominees, etc. The benefits paid annually amount to over two millions sterling, the total accumulated funds being over twenty millions. In registered societies alone there are about fourteen millions in hand, invested and otherwise. As registration is purely voluntary, many societies decline to register; it is computed that not less than 12,000 altogether decline registration.* The principle of permissive legislation, as a rule, is not good; but there are some cases where it is better to apply this principle than not to legislate at all. Moreover, voluntaryism is the foundation of self-help, and to apply the principle of compulsion to either friendly societies or trade unions would perhaps produce more mischief than would be compensated for by any good which could be effected. In the course of time those societies which register, and send in their annual returns to the Registrar, will command greater confidence on the part of the masses, and will consequently necessitate registration, as a condition of existence; for publicity will become a guarantee of stability, whereas the refusal to do so will be regarded with suspicion, and those societies which do not register, will be shunned.

§ 9. There are many points of contact between trade unions and friendly societies, especially in their provisions for mutual aid and support in case of sickness and death, and they are drawing nearer and nearer to each other continually. In their

* It is extremely difficult to obtain accurate statistics of Friendly Societies up to date. The quinquennial Returns for the five years ending 1885 are not issued at this date (June 26th, 1890). The last Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, issued January, 1890, does not give the number of members or funds for the year 1888!!!

essential nature and attributes they have much in common; there are, however, some special and prominent features which must ever remain distinct and separate, as being peculiar to the one, and not possible with the other. Hence the necessity for independent statutory enactments, each dealing with the particular characteristics pertaining to that class of societies for which the enactment is designed. There is just as much need for keeping trade unions distinct from friendly societies as there is in the case of building societies, or co-operative associations, inasmuch as some of the objects of the trade union are quite as incompatible with those of the friendly society, as are the other two mentioned. It would be impossible to incorporate them under the same law, without great risk and danger; and the evil consequences of such an Act would be equally disastrous to both forms of association. Still, they are all sufficiently alike to be under the control of one department, and subject to the supervision of the same Registrar. The returns are very similar, so are many of the forms; the rules, also, are often nearly alike in substance and in form. The essence even of their objects is the same, but the ends and the means are so completely different that they require separate treatment. Recent legislation has tended to develop a closer affinity between the two bodies. This was manifestly so in the Trade Union Act, 1876, in which nearly the whole of the sections went in the direction of assimilating the law to the Friendly Societies' Acts, 1875–6; many of the provisions were, in fact, taken from the last-mentioned Acts. All this brings out more strongly the close resemblance between the two classes of organisations; and so impressed is the Registrar with this similarity of constitution and aims, that he thinks, and has long thought, that they can well be amalgamated, or, rather, brought under one consolidated statute. The officers and leaders of the unions, as a rule, think otherwise; they can see points of divergence, as well as of analogy; and their fear is that such a process of fusion would be disastrous to both, and only end in useless squabbles, and possibly in costly litigation. On one point all were agreed, namely, that the Registrar was a competent, and generally a trustworthy authority, and a friendly

judge. His opinions, therefore, were entitled to consideration and respect, although on this matter they were opposed to those held by the men whose duty it was to conduct the unions, watch over the interests of the members, and preserve the special features for which the unions were originally formed. However, the law as it now stands, is not likely to be disturbed for many years; each form of association may therefore peaceably pursue its own course, and seek its own ends, in its own way.

§ 10. The fundamental distinctions to be drawn between the friendly society and the trade union are: (1) The trade union is restricted to members of the same handicraft, whereas the friendly society is general and open to all comers, without limitation as to trade or class, subject, of course, to the conditions of membership being fulfilled, as provided in the rules. This, in itself, was one of the causes which led to the formation of the trade society pure and simple; it was a return, so to speak, to the guild system, which was confined to particular trades. The fact that the friendly society was general, and open to all, gave it a great advantage over the trade union, for it was able to embrace a wider area, and consequently its members increased more rapidly; moreover, the elements of possible discord were fewer and unimportant, as compared with those in trade societies, hence their growth in numbers and in wealth during the earlier half of the present century. (2) The trade union deals primarily with questions of wages, hours of labour, conditions of employment, and other matters, economical and social; and often with those of a quasi-political character, upon all of which great differences of opinion frequently arise, even among those who are members of the same association. (3) The friendly society benefits in trade unions are at all times subordinate to those relating to trade privileges; they were in reality an afterthought, in most instances designed to keep the members together, by reason of the multiplied advantages and the increased interests involved in, and bound up with, one society. It would perhaps be difficult to find a member of a trade union who joined it chiefly for the friendly benefits, great as these are in some of the best unions; doubtlessly the para-

mount object in all cases is the trade benefits. (4) The out-of-work benefit, so important in the trade union, is impossible in the friendly society. This feature must ever remain as a peculiar characteristic of the trade union, applicable only to a society whose operations are limited to the comparatively narrow circle of those who follow the same employment, and are subject to the same conditions and fluctuations in trade.

§ 11. It is often urged that the friendly society objects, and those for trade purposes only, should be separated, and that the funds of both should be kept distinct. This has been partially done in some unions, but it is extremely doubtful whether by so doing they have not rendered themselves liable to legal proceedings in certain cases, when the funds of the one have been used for the purposes of the other. Such unions must be informed, if they are not already aware of the fact, that the law relating to friendly societies is very severe, with regard to the use of any part of their funds for any purposes other than those provided for in the rules. In the eye of the law it would amount to misappropriation, however good the object might have been for which they were so used. Those who mainly urge this separation of funds are desirous of weakening the trade union, and of strengthening the friendly society element; from their point of view their action is right enough. In the opinion of those who regard trade unions as institutions for positive good, quite apart from their incidental benefits, it would be unwise, if not absolutely dangerous, to insist upon any such separation. Some persons advocate it on less selfish grounds; but they are unacquainted with the working of the unions, and cannot judge as to the probable results. It should be stated that in very many trade societies the members can join the trade fund without contributing to the sick fund, in case they are already members of other benefit societies. Trade unions must be taken as a whole, subject to whatever aims they may have, or the ends which they seek, and the means which they adopt. In the nature of things, they will improve as society progresses, and as public opinion is brought to bear upon them in an intelligent manner, moderated by a fuller knowledge of their constitution and working. Their strength must ever consist in the justice

of their claims and demands, and in the reasonableness of the methods which they may adopt in order to secure them.

§ 12. By the Act of 1876, trade unions are so completely recognised as corporate bodies, for beneficent purposes, that they now stand on a footing of equality, side by side with all other similar associations. They were placed on a sound basis, and treated on equal terms, after a persistent refusal extending over quite three-quarters of a century. Every one of the demands put forward by the unions was conceded; clauses or parts of clauses from the Friendly Societies' Act were incorporated and passed for their express benefit. Even the new definition clause was introduced for their special advantage. A curious example of the want of correct information on these matters was exhibited at the time by a prominent Member of Parliament. Sir Charles Dilke, in addressing his then constituents at Chelsea, is reported to have said that "the Trade Union Acts were spoilt during their passage through the House by the insertion of obscure definition clauses." If the honourable baronet had taken that interest in the question which his words would seem to imply, he should have known that the alleged "obscure definition clauses" were drafted by one of the oldest, ablest, and best friends of trade unions; every section and clause being submitted to the leaders of the workmen before they were placed on the notice paper of the House of Commons. They also had the advantage of being examined, considered, and revised by gentlemen both in and out of parliament, who for many years had devoted their best energies to these matters, always for the special benefit of the working classes. If Sir Charles Dilke, whose sympathies broadly are with the people, had wrong impressions with regard to this question, how much more were others then likely to entertain erroneous opinions, and to express themselves wildly on such subjects?

§ 13. One aspect in connection with the relationship subsisting between the friendly society and the trade union, was for a long time far from being satisfactory, namely, the reluctance of some of the unions to register their rules. This arose from a prejudice, mainly the result of past legislation, and particularly of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1871, on account of its

forming part of the Trade Union Bill itself, being the third section, but which was afterwards omitted, and brought in as a separate Bill. Again, many of the unions considered that they had nothing to gain by registration, but possibly something to lose. That the advantages of registering their rules are not so great as they might be, must be admitted; still, there are many reasons why they should avail themselves of an Act passed for their special benefit. Under it, their funds are in all cases more effectually protected, and their recovery is more simple and easy, and, above all, they are able to call in the aid of the civil powers of summary jurisdiction, instead of applying the criminal law in every instance, whether the misappropriation, if any, has been the result of wilful fraud, or was caused by accidental circumstance, which, however wrong in itself, does not deserve a criminal prosecution, and in which the ends of justice would be served by a civil process only. But perhaps the chief reason why many refuse to register is their absurd prejudice against making known their exact position, through the annual returns published by the Registrar. Some unions absolutely refuse to give any information even to their friends, well-wishers, and defenders, for fear lest employers might know their weakness. This is as futile as it is unwise; their supposed secrecy tends rather to an under than over-estimate of their strength; it serves no useful purpose, and gives currency to the notion that the combination is a secret one, and has objects which are indefensible, opposed to public policy, and therefore to be condemned. It must ever be remembered that equality before the law means equality of duties as well as of rights; exemptions and privileges are alike in violation of this principle.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONCLUSION—GENERAL REVIEW, PRESENT POSITION AND FUTURE OF TRADE UNIONS.

§ 1. In the preceding pages the history of trade unions has been traced from their origin and descent from the old guilds, to the present day. We have seen something of their inception and birth, have watched their development through infancy and childhood, and followed their progress through youth up to the time when they attained the age of manhood, and became recognised by law as an institution and social force in the State. We have drawn attention to their struggles, as step by step they endeavoured to free themselves from the old combination laws, and have indicated the several victories won by them, until, in 1871, the legislature declared them to be lawful associations, and extended its protection to their corporate property and funds. Even then the objects only were legalised, but not the means by which they sought to attain those objects. They only obtained their full legal majority in 1875, by the passing of the "Labour Laws," which not only sanctioned the objects, but legalised the means, so long as those means are peaceable, and do not interfere, or attempt to interfere with the personal liberty and freedom of action of other citizens. We now behold them in the full vigour of their manhood, unshackled and free, with a long history, and a record of work which is not inglorious; with immense resources in numbers and in wealth, and possessed of no mean advantages with which to encounter the great battles of industrial life.

§ 2. The important question often asked is: Are not great dangers to be apprehended from these vast organisations of the

industrial classes, lest they should wield their enormous power imprudently and unwisely, nay mischievously, to the disadvantage of those not within their own ranks? Danger? Yes. There is always a danger to the body politic in combinations of classes, and aggregations of forces, unless they are restrained by a wise prudence, and their deliberations are open to the light of day. It is sometimes necessary to call in the power of the legislature to adjust the incidence of the force thus created, to temper its action, or punish the excesses of those who trespass beyond the clear line of social order and just law. The old feudal barons used their power with terrific violence, until municipal law stepped in to curb its force, and reduce it to some kind of limit. The aristocracy which grew out of the old system of feudalism wielded an immense and destructive power, until the middle and the working classes combined, in 1830, and wrenched from them a portion of their monopoly of power. The middle classes, having obtained their ends in 1832, soon forgot their promises to the working classes, and used their newly acquired influence almost exclusively for their own benefit. They developed their resources and their strength, and made rapid inroads upon the power of the aristocracy, but the new party did not extend a helping hand to those who were struggling for their own emancipation from the effects of earlier legislation. They unwisely and ungenerously continued the laws against combination and free contract, and very often aggravated their force by countenancing a new engine of repression, in the shape of the conspiracy laws, or the application of the common law of conspiracy to trade disputes, which, after the Reform Act of 1832, became more frequent than ever in the newer forms of antagonism between capital and labour, resulting from the repeal of the combination laws.

§ 3. The repeal of these laws was mainly due to the indomitable will, energy, and perseverance of the workmen themselves, backed up by the wealth and power of the unions, organised and controlled by men who knew what they wanted, and the requirements of those for whom they laboured. Those leaders were earnest, capable, and honourable men, and they had to do battle with every political party and faction in the

State, in order to accomplish what they deemed to be a fair and just settlement of their claims. The monopoly of power, class privileges, and combinations for particular interests which then existed, and which the workmen succeeded in breaking down, were a source of danger. And all similar congeries of collective power, privilege, and combination must be a source of danger, present or future, if the government of those unions of force remained in the hands of violent, aggressive, and ignorant men. This, however, is not generally the case. Consequently we may look forward hopefully to the future of trade unions with full confidence, inspired by their past history, and fortified by their present action and work, that their authority and influence will be exercised with moderation, with due regard to the rights of others, and the duties which they owe to the community. The State is bound to extend its protection to all, without favour or preference, whether to individuals or to classes; and all are equally bound to obey its mandates, and uphold its authority, and to perform their duties and fulfil their obligations as free citizens of a free state. Equality of rights involves a corresponding equality of responsibilities; the man or the men who overlook this fact can only be regarded as political mountebanks, whose advocacy will land working men in a quagmire.

§ 4. Up to a quite recent date, trade unions had almost necessarily confined their action to objects and measures chiefly affecting their own members, as trade unionists; but the sphere of their action is no longer limited to their own comparatively narrow circle. Not so their leaders. As men and citizens they have taken a broader view, and have associated themselves with the political, social, and intellectual movements of the times in which they lived. Gradually the unions have broadened their action, as they were freed from legal restrictions and disabilities. Disregarding class, party, and sect, they have taken some share in moulding public opinion, and in formulating and passing measures for the common good. This action will extend in proportion as trade unionists take their proper position as citizens, and realise their strength as component parts of the organisations to which they belong, in every constituency in the

kingdom. The mere voting power of trade unions is enormous, if properly utilised. This power has been and can be utilised for the purpose of sending into parliament some picked men, of sufficient ability to defend their interests, and maintaining the concessions already made by the legislature. This influence has been, and can in the future be, utilised for local and municipal as well as for imperial purposes. They must, however, remember that seats are won by votes and numbers, not by mere talking. The miners in this respect have shown a good example to the trades of the United Kingdom, and also the agricultural labourers in the elections of the county councils. The hint thrown out in the first edition of this work was not forgotten in the general elections of 1880, and again in 1885 and 1886. The county council elections of 1888 attest the power and influence of trade unions in local contests, a power capable of indefinite extension. The legislation of the last ten years, and the work accomplished in connection with county councils and other local bodies, furnish conclusive evidence as to the value of the work of practical men of the working class, both in statutory enactment and in the administration of public affairs.

§ 5. Many circumstances conspired to induce trade unions to take a broader view. The discovery that their funds were unprotected, the passing of the Criminal Law Amendment Act in 1871, and subsequently the blow struck at picketing in the Local Acts of Manchester and Glasgow, by which police authority was enabled to override the statute law. Then came the yearning for the rights of citizenship. Unionists took part in the Franchise movements, and the battle for the rights of labour was transferred to the ballot-box. The results began to be seen in the general election of 1868. The action then taken was followed by concerted action throughout that parliament. In the general election of 1874 the Labour Laws formed a more prominent feature in the contests than many were willing to admit. Among the first-fruits of that contest was the Commission to inquire into the question; and in 1875 came the measures for the repeal of the remnant of the old combination laws, and of the conspiracy laws, in so far as

they pertained to labour disputes. The passing of these measures left the unions free to enlarge the scope of their operations, and each successive year has found them becoming more and more associations for general purposes than they had been previously.

§ 6. As a proof that the unions were adapting themselves to the newer conditions under which they lived, the parliamentary programme for 1878 was quite a new departure from the programme of some previous Congresses. That programme was divisible into two parts; the first had reference to measures directly affecting the working classes in their associative capacity, the second embraced several subjects having an important bearing upon the whole community. The chief questions dealt with were measures:

I. (*a*) To amend the law of compensation in cases of accidents, so that workmen, or, in case of death, their families, might recover from an employer some compensation in the event of injury or death, from accidents due to negligence. (*b*) To secure the passing of a Bill to amend and consolidate the laws relating to factories and workshops. (*c*) To secure the extension of the Employers and Workmen Act, 1875, to British seamen whilst in British waters. And (*d*) To secure compulsory certificates of competency for men in charge of steam-engines and boilers. Of those measures three have been passed, while the fourth is conceded in principle, the method of its enactment being but a mere matter of detail to be settled hereafter by parliament.

II. The more general portion of the programme included the administration of justice, such as: (*a*) The reform of the Laws as to the Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates. (*b*) An alteration in the mode of appointing unpaid and unqualified magistrates, and of their removal. (*c*) Reform of the Jury Laws. (*d*) Codification of the Criminal Laws. (*e*) The abolition of Imprisonment for Debt. And also (*f*) The reform of the Patent Laws. Of these six measures, three have been carried, and an important step has been taken towards the realisation of a fourth, namely, codification of the Criminal Laws. Very important changes have been introduced in the procedure and

administration of justice since 1877, and the Patent Laws have been practically remodelled.

§ 7. At the Congress held in Dundee, in September, 1889, the Parliamentary Committee did not formulate any elaborate programme, beyond the demand for an amendment of the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, of the Limited Liability Acts, and of the Merchant Shipping Acts, the last two being already dealt with. The Eight Hours' Day and Factory Inspection were matters of debate and of resolutions. In other respects the discussions were more general and personal than they had been at many previous Congresses. The delegates, however, reaffirmed some of the decisions of former years relating to measures not yet embodied in law, but which are no longer very strongly opposed in the House of Commons.

§ 8. The general achievements of trade unions during the present century have been indicated in the earlier chapters of this work; their more recent triumphs have been specially chronicled in Chapter X. (Labour in Coalition, Part III.), on Trades Union Congresses. It is not so much, however, in specific performances that their record of work is seen to the greatest advantage. It is rather in those unrecorded fields of labour, which constitute the everyday-life work of the unions, that they display their power, wield their influence, and achieve their more permanent successes. The improved condition of the working classes to-day is largely due to their efforts. The improvement has been slow, terribly slow: and it is not so apparent to the younger generation as to those whose age and experience take them back to the "forties" and the "fifties" of the present century. The progress, nevertheless, has been real and substantial, in material advantages—wages and hours of labour; in social position—by the recognition of industrial rights; in political status—by enfranchisement, and election to the highest posts open to popular election; in constitutional rights and judicial obligation—by the repeal of repressive and disabling laws, and by the enactment of more just and equitable enabling laws. Equality before the law is not only recognised as an abstract principle, but is embodied in statutory enactment, not in its fulness, perhaps, but generally; and even in the

administration of justice the position of workmen has improved enormously of late years.

§ 9. The position of trade unions is altogether changed since the first issue of this work. In several chapters, their position at and just before that date is either clearly stated or indicated. The general feeling at that time was that at best they were but a nuisance, and many advocated their suppression by law. By degrees that feeling subsided. Slowly and gradually they won their way in popular favour, and obtained something like authoritative recognition, as an important factor in the evolution of industry in this country. In 1885 the Royal Commission on Depression in Trade considered the whole question of their operations and influence in relation to labour, and unanimously reported thereon, in several paragraphs, as follows:

(79) Considerable importance is attached by some witnesses who have appeared before us to the effect upon trade of legislative restrictions on the employment of labour and to the action of the working classes themselves by strikes and similar movements in making production in this country more costly than elsewhere.

But we do not think that either of these causes has materially affected the general prosperity of the country.

(80) With regard to the comparative efficiency of labour carried on under the conditions which prevail in this country and foreign countries respectively, there would appear to be great difference of opinion, But those who have had personal experience of both appear to incline to the view that the English workman, notwithstanding his shorter hours and higher wages, is to be preferred.

On this point we would call special attention to the communication from Messrs. Holden and Sons, quoted by Sir Jacob Behrens in his answer to question 6,754. Messrs. Holden have a large manufacturing business both at Bradford and in the neighbourhood of Roubaix, in France; and they state that they can produce "in England at a price leaving a profit, which in France would barely cover cost." Sir Jacob Behrens remarks that "the fiscal policy of France may have something to do with it, but not, in my opinion, so much as the intrinsically greater value of English labour."

We may add that as Messrs. Holden make their own machinery, and as their business appears to be carried on under substantially

similar conditions in both countries, the difference above alluded to must be to a large extent at any rate due to labour.

(81) But whatever may be the comparative advantage of the longer hours which are worked abroad, we cannot recommend, and we feel satisfied that public opinion in this country would not accept, any legislative measure tending to an increase in the present number of hours of labour.

There is no feature in the situation which we have been called upon to examine so satisfactory as the immense improvement which has taken place in the condition of the working classes during the last twenty years. At the present moment there is, as we have already pointed out, a good deal of distress owing to the want of regular work, but there can be no question that the workman in this country is, when fully employed, in almost every respect in a better position than his competitors in foreign countries, and we think that no diminution in our productive capacity has resulted from this improvement in his position.

(83) As regards the future, should any symptoms present themselves that foreign competition is becoming more effective in this respect, it must be for the country and the workman himself to decide whether the advantages of the shorter hours compensate for the increased cost of production or diminished output. We believe that they do, and on social as well as economical grounds we should regret to see any curtailment of the leisure and freedom which the workman now enjoys. No advantages which could be expected to accrue to the commerce of the country would in our opinion compensate for such a change.

(84) We may add that in our opinion the unfavourable elements in the existing condition of trade and industry cannot with any justice be attributed to the action of trades unions and similar combinations.

The administration of these associations has not infrequently laid them open to criticism; but we feel bound to record our opinion that, in recent years they have, on the whole, been conducted with propriety and judgment.

§ 10. The elaborate inquiry by a Select Committee of the House of Lords into the Sweating System, and the careful investigation into the causes of and remedies for the state of things that exists in connection with many branches of industry, skilled and unskilled, led their lordships to suggest combination as one of their recommendations. In paragraph 186 the report says: "With respect to the low wages and excessive hours of labour,

we think that good may be effected by the extension of co-operative societies, and by well-considered combination amongst the workers." It is a sign of the times when a Lords' Committee, however timidly, are found giving their sanction to a form of association, hitherto usually regarded by that chamber as dangerous and mischievous, socially, industrially, and economically. It is even more significant that the Heir-Apparent to the throne, His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, has entertained the representatives of labour, delegates to the London Trades' Council, and others, though some of them were roundly abused for their acceptance of the invitation to visit Sandringham. Those who were so loud in their abuse, did not perceive that the visit was a compliment socially paid to labour, honourable to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and a recognition of the dignity of labour. The carping criticism levelled against those who paid that visit was all the more ungracious, because of the fact that their critics had often been loud in their complaints as to the non-recognition of the working class by the wealthier classes of the community. Every such recognition is a further step in advance towards social equality.

§ 11. Still more remarkable was the International Labour Conference held at Berlin, in March of this year, 1890. The conference was invited by the Emperor of Germany to discuss some questions relating to labour generally, and with the view of seeing whether an International agreement could be arrived at as regards Factory Legislation, legislation relating to mines, and other matters. Three delegates, specially associated with the cause of labour, were appointed by the Government to attend the conference, Mr. John Burnett, the Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade, Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., and Mr. Thomas Birtwistle, of the Weavers' Association. Whatever may be the immediate outcome of that conference, it is the first time that such a conference was ever convened by one of the crowned heads of Europe, and that one the youngest in years, and representing one of the greatest of European Powers. Moreover the conduct and attitude of the Emperor towards, and in respect of, the labour delegates was significant in itself. His Imperial Majesty recognised the men who were

directly associated with labour, in a way which reflected the highest credit upon the occupant of the Imperial Throne of Germany. No event perhaps in our time denotes so clearly the progress made in social and industrial questions. Possibly it may have an important influence upon the peace of the world. The peoples will feel that war and bloodshed are brutal and ruinous, and that peaceful and honourable rivalry will best display the greatness, the power, and the lasting influence of a nation and a race, as the fittest to survive and rule, among the nations of the earth.

§ 12. One further evidence of the immense change in the position of trade unions, and in public opinion, is the movement in favour of a recognition by parliament, and by municipal and local bodies, of what is termed the current wages of the district, or the minimum wages in a given trade, in a given locality; and also of the recognised working hours which shall constitute a working day, and other conditions of labour. The London School Board, and the London County Council, have taken the lead in providing in their contracts, and in arrangements with their employés, that competition shall not operate so as to reduce wages, but that the current rates shall be a condition in all contracts and work undertaken by those bodies. This does not mean an interference in contracts by fixing wages or hours of labour, but that the rates shall not be reduced, or the hours extended, for the purpose of increasing the profits of the contractor, or middleman. Progress is also being made in the same direction in parliament, though to what extent is not yet quite apparent. No sensible and humane man will contend that the State or the municipality should give countenance in any way to a system which would impoverish the worker for either the benefit of the middleman or contractor, or even with the view of reducing the rates and taxes. Poverty is the most ruinous element in both imperial and local finance. It is not only immoral, but is opposed to true economy, to starve wages, whether it be to increase profits or relieve the rates.

§ 13. The increased recognition, and extended influence, carry with them greater responsibility, in a corresponding ratio. Trade unions have to consider how far they fulfil their obliga-

tions to their own members, and to the community of which the members form part. The material welfare of the members is their first duty and concern. But that material welfare might not, nay, does not, merely depend solely upon the rate of wages. Other matters go to make up the sum total of prosperity, well-being, and happiness. The value of wages depends upon their purchasing power, and upon the use made of income, from whatever source. The right to spend, or misspend, of course exists; but there are social and moral obligations devolving upon every one to use wisely and prudently that which he obtains. In no other way can workmen attain to that independence which is the source of strength, and the foundation of human happiness. Trade unions, friendly societies, co-operative societies, and similar institutions, provide a means for attaining and conserving that independence. Self-reliance is inspired and developed by mutual help; the latter was never meant to supplant or supersede the former; nor is the former inconsistent with the latter. Associative effort will find its highest level in proportion as all the elements in the body corporate are healthfully self-reliant, and manfully united for the common good of all. But association will not be strong, however numerous in membership, if the units that compose it are cowards. It will sustain timidity, and even weakness, but it cannot create true valour, a quality which is self-sustaining.

§ 14. The value of the work of trade unions, and their wide-spread influence, may be traced in many directions, and in manifold ways, other than by increased wages and reduced working hours, triumphant as their influence has been in these respects. One feature has hitherto escaped the notice of economical writers, namely, the higher average duration of life attained by the members of the unions in recent compared with former years. The average age of those deceased in 1889, in the Ironfounders' Society, was 54 years 9 months; and of their wives, 49 years 4 months. The average age at death during the last five years has been for the members 52½ years, and for their wives 49 years, which is a very high average for so laborious and exposed a branch of industry. The average duration of life in the Steam-engine Makers' Society has increased from 46 years,

in 1876, to 50½ on the average of the last two years; an increase of four years; and of their wives, 5½ years since 1876. The average is rising and has been for the last twenty years in the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, the average now being 49 for members, and 45¼ for members' wives; in the Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, the Amalgamated Carpenters, and in other unions, whose records enable us to follow the facts and trace the causes. This longer duration of life speaks volumes. It shows that the conditions of life and labour are better; that there has been real progress and substantial improvement; that the homes of the people are better, for the wives share in that record of a longer duration of life. What is true of the heads of the family, cannot fail to be true of the younger branches. Much of this improvement has been due to the provision for out-of-work, sickness, superannuation, and accident benefits, all of which tell in the death-roll of the members. The average age at death of superannuated members was 70 years in 1889, in the Iron-founders' Society.

§ 15. The prospective work of trade unions must depend upon a variety of circumstances, the dominant factors in which cannot now be determined. The measures promoted by the Trades Union Congress are somewhat narrowed down by the legislation of the last twenty-two years. Improvements in the Factory and Workshop Acts, extended supervision and inspection in various industries, the amendment of the Employers' Liability Act, and a few other measures, are the chief, in so far as labour is directly concerned. But the Congress need not restrict itself to this narrow programme. It represents a vast aggregate constituency of workers, who are citizens as well as trade unionists, and all general legislation which has for its object the welfare of the masses comes within its scope, not from a party political standpoint, but from a national point of view. If selected with care and judgment, and promoted with single-mindedness of purpose, many measures might be advantageously added to the parliamentary programme. Hot-headedness will but produce schism, and disintegration will follow disunion; therefore, tolerable unanimity is essential in extending the sphere of their action to measures of public utility not specifi-

cally pertaining to labour. In considering such measures the unionists of the United Kingdom must remember that they are citizens; that the laws they seek to place on the Statute Book must be universal in their application; and that nearly as much depends upon the administration of the law as upon its enactment. These facts remembered and acted upon will conduce to the welfare of the State.

§ 16. The work of trade unions need not be restricted to parliamentary and other public work. When they extend the sphere of their action beyond wages, hours of labour, and other objects specifically provided for in their rules, they may achieve triumphs and promote the welfare of their members in other directions, quite within the scope of their organisation. For example, they have vast funds standing to their credit in joint stock banks, and in the Post Office Savings Banks, which might be judiciously utilised in providing better homes for their members. If properly managed, their funds might be invested at a higher interest in such manner as to enable thousands of members to acquire their own dwellings, and in obtaining the best articles of food and clothing and other necessaries at the lowest market prices on the co-operative system. Care and prudence would be required to accomplish this, but it could be done. In the past there has been a great waste of energy and of wealth; in the future this might be avoided. They have only to extend, under their own management, and in their own way, the principles of their own benefits for sickness, accident, out of work, and other provisions. They have opportunities also for other useful work, such as sending picked craftsmen to exhibitions, to study the productions of competitors in other countries, and report thereon; the collection of the statistics of trade, reports on styles and quality of workmanship, capacity of workers, cost of materials, wages, hours of labour, prices of food, etc., habits of workmen, and general condition of their homes, and many other matters of enduring interest to themselves and to all classes of the community. Every society and lodge might have a small select library of books on industrial and technical questions for the use of the members. In numerous ways they might widen the circle

of their influence, increase their strength and importance, consolidate their power, and attain a more direct and permanent command over the destinies of labour, and all that concerns the welfare of the worker.

§ 17. It is difficult, extremely difficult, to prognosticate as to the future of labour. The Utopian dreams of the "friends of labour" differ vastly, according to the views, the culture, and the experience of the dreamers. We hear vague declamations about getting rid of capitalists, abolishing profits, and doing away with wages, hiring, contracts of service, etc., and of thereby adding to the welfare of the masses, and promoting the prosperity of the people. Labour's Utopia has been described as having reached the acme of perfection under municipal law, where the people are fed by a State-spoon, out of a State-platter, doled out by a State official, in a State uniform. Where the workers are no longer independent, self-reliant men and women, but parts of a huge State machine, moving mechanically in a State groove, under State regulation. No such dream has actuated the writer of these pages. He has endeavoured to promote the liberty of the subject, freedom of association, better wages for working people, extended leisure, a higher standard of living, improved conditions of life and labour, healthier homes, wider culture, and nobler aspirations. To these objects his whole life has been devoted. If a nobler, a better, and a speedier way can be found, he will not object; but, until it can be demonstrated that the old methods have failed, he relies upon individual exertion, and mutual help by associative effort, to at least ameliorate the condition of the workers. If the advantages gained, and the opportunities now offered are properly utilised, the future of labour, if it does not realise the dreams of enthusiasts, will be improved, the workers will be elevated, the country will prosper, and happiness will dwell in the land.

APPENDICES.

WITH the view of further illustrating some points in the preceding pages, the following series of tables and notes are appended. Their incorporation in the text would only have encumbered it, without giving that bird's-eye view which is presented in the fuller tables here given. These Appendices are but examples in elucidation of the text.

I.—Trade Unions : Tables of Members, Income, Expenditure, Balance in hand, Payments for Benefits, etc.—(*a*) Amalgamated Society of Engineers ; (*b*) Steam-engine Makers; (*c*) Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders ; (*d*) Ironfounders ; (*e*) Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners, etc.

II.—Rates of Wages Table.

III.—Schedule or specimen of Strike Form to be filled in by Branches when application is made to the Executive for their sanction to strike.

IV.—Votes of Trade Unionists on the Eight Hours System.

V.—Abstract of Returns on Systematic Overtime worked in Government Factories, 1884 to 1890.

VI.—Tables of Dates, Places, Representation, Income, Expenditure, Balance in hand, etc., of the twenty-two Trades Union Congresses, 1868 to 1889 inclusive.

VII.—Foreign Competition : Abstracts of Returns, 1877 to 1890, of chief groups of aggregate Exports of Manufactured Articles by Foreign Countries.

VIII.—List of chief Works and Authorities, Papers and Returns, Magazine Articles, etc., referred to and consulted in the preparation of this work.

I.—TRADE UNIONS.

I.—AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS.

(*a*) Summary of Expenditure for 1876 and 1889, as given in the Annual Reports of the Society.—Comparison of the two periods.

General Heads of Expenditure.	1876.						1889.					
	Total Expenditure.			Average per Member.			Total Expenditure.			Average per Member.		
	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
Donation and Contingent Benefit, sending Members to situations, and beds to non-free members..	45,036	0	7	1	0	2½	29,733	16	5	0	10	7½
Sick Benefit, Stewards, and Medical Certificates	23,242	13	3	0	10	5	30,992	13	1	0	11	0¾
Superannuation Allowance ..	12,538	13	2	0	5	7¼	40,170	0	10	0	14	4¼
Funerals—Members and Wives ..	7,539	15	10	0	3	4½	9,289	3	2	0	3	3¾
Accidents—total or partial Disablement	1,100	0	0	0	0	6	2,177	3	10	0	0	9½
Grants from Benevolent Fund ..	3,755	19	1	0	1	8¼	2,050	3	5	0	0	8¾
Printing, Stationery, Emblems, Postages, Telegrams, and Parcels	4,448	7	10	0	2	0	3,076	14	6	0	1	1½
Branch Expenditure—Officers and Committee, Executive Council Meetings, Secretaries, Treasurers, Auditors, Banking Expenses, and Delegations—total	7,313	0	8	0	3	3¼	9,581	12	4	0	3	5
Purchasing and repairing Property, Club and Cash Boxes, Packing Cases, Stamps, Bags, etc.	335	14	3	0	0	1¾	269	4	6	0	0	1¼
Proposition Money, Entrance Fees, and Fines returned; Lost Time, Bad Coin, Errors and Deficiencies, Law Expenses, Removal Expenses, etc.	458	10	4	0	0	2½	475	7	2	0	0	2
Grants to their own and other Trades, Loss of Tools by Fire, Grants to Parliamentary Committee, etc.	1,815	7	6	0	0	9¾	1,920	13	8	0	0	8
Rent, Fuel, Gas, Rates and Taxes, etc.	1,624	8	11	0	0	9½	2,023	9	5	0	0	8¾
Lease of Offices	..			..			800	0	0	0	0	3½
Total Amounts	109,208	11	5	2	9	0¼	132,560	2	5	2	7	4¼

The figures for 1876 are the same as given in the First Edition; the figures for 1889 will serve as a basis of comparison, showing as they do under what heads and for what purposes, generally speaking, the payments are made, and the amounts.

AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS—*continued.*

(*b*) Summary of Expenditure for Benefits for Thirty-nine Years, and Balance at the end of each Year.—Amounts paid in each year for :

Year.	No. of Members.	Donation—Out-of-Work.	Sick Benefit.	Superannuation Allowance.	Accident Benefit.	Funerals—Members & Wives.	Benevolent Fund Grants.	Assistance to other Trades, etc.	Total Balance at the end of each Year.
		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£ s. d.
1851	11,829	5,111	2,809	120	350	847	..	..	21,705 4 11
1852									
Jan.	11,617	43,559	1,987	179	100	533	..	..	1,721 2 11
Dec.	9,737	3,111	1,802	206	250	464	..	..	5,382 1 3
1853	10,757	2,622	4,047	503	200	1,304	..	296	17,812 16 7
1854	11,617	4,364	4,232	518	100	1,295	181	1,075	20,202 11 9
1855	12,553	12,278	5,045	585	300	1,300	148	145	35,695 1 11
1856	13,405	12,803	5,292	714	450	1,561	277	200	43,207 18 3
1857	14,299	14,160	5,980	898	1,150	1,593	178	263	47,947 4 10
1858	15,194	35,390	6,778	1,449	1,400	2,351	105	193	30 353 12 1
1859	17,790	15,863	8,094	2,109	600	2,547	315	2,626	36,831 19 8
1860	20,935	7,841	8,421	2,370	900	2,372	275	1,385	60,198 1 6
1861	22,862	20,474	9,816	2,439	700	2,998	394	447	73,398 1 0
1862	24,234	39,116	10,847	2,654	1,200	3,031	1,086	398	67,615 16 6
1863	26,058	32,653	12,580	3,105	1,800	3,593	1,526	280	67,410 3 8
1864	28,815	16,425	13,612	3,902	1,100	3,924	1,095	639	86,947 15 0
1865	30,984	14,070	13,785	5,184	1,800	4,887	820	468	115,357 13 10
1866	33,007	22,782	13,712	5,232	1,600	5,319	851	1,360	138,113 8 3
1867	33,325	58,243	15,557	5,982	1,000	5,282	2,249	600	125,263 2 7
1868	33,474	64,979	16,992	7,123	1,000	5,049	3,026	..	98,699 2 1
1869	33,539	59,980	17,777	8,055	1,600	5,600	2,351	50	76,176 7 10
1870	34,711	32,707	18,195	8,994	1,600	5,792	1,662	384	82,467 7 0
1871	37,790	12,357	18,496	8,942	700	6 205	1,241	30	116,326 6 7
1872	41,075	15,377	18,563	9,116	1,100	6,273	1,337	297	158,313 15 10
1873	42,382	15,562	18,022	9,477	1,800	6,567	1,436	694	200,923 1 7
1874	43,150	21,093	20,014	10,430	1,300	6,684	1,907	1,459	238,989 10 9
1875	44,032	31,560	22,495	11,109	1,800	7,889	2,737	3,592	264,641 17 1
1876	44,578	45,036	23,242	12,538	1,100	7,539	3,755	1,815	275,146 15 9
1877	45,071	54,470	23,257	13,858	2,200	7,659	3,983	1,515	275,270 0 2
1878	45,408	75,552	24,054	15,706	1,500	7,874	4,089	2,681	251,675 8 6
1879	44,078	149,931	26,514	17,730	1,800	7,387	6,378	20,576	141,116 6 10
1880	44,692	62,113	24,202	20,958	1,900	6,553	3,473	4,344	130,074 0 3
1881	46,101	40,017	25,672	23,524	2,500	7,863	2,052	510	145,957 4 5
1882	48,388	23,043	26,272	26,311	1,800	7,648	1,931	389	168,200 6 3
1883	50,418	35,252	27,448	28,496	1,500	8,620	2,259	4,775	178,125 7 10
1884	50,681	62,310	29,074	30,519	2,100	8,253	3,297	20,579	162,768 10 7
1885	51,689	78,669	30,877	32,608	1,800	8,689	4,160	9,673	119,130 9 2
1886	52,019	86,460	30,462	33,951	1,400	8,881	3,361	324	111,678 16 2
1887	51,869	80,458	31,138	36,163	1,850	9,021	2,554	607	125,120 7 10
1888	53,740	54,740	32,160	38,343	3,053	9,381	2,059	75	158,769 19 3
1889	60,728	29,733	30,992	40,170	2,177	8,289	2,050	1,920	209,779 13 0
		1,492,264	680,314	482,270	52,630	209,917	70,598	86,664	

Summary of above—39 years.	Total Amounts. £	Average per Member. £ s. d.
Donations—Out-of-Work—	1,492 264	.. 45 11 9½
Sick Benefit	680,314	.. 19 0 3½
Superannuation Allowance	482,270	.. 11 3 3½
Accident Benefit	52,630	.. 1 11 7
Funerals—Members and Wives	209,917	.. 5 17 1½
Benevolent Grants	70,594	.. 1 17 8½
Assistance to own and other Trades ..	86,664	.. 2 2 8½
Totals—39 years	3,074,653	Per Member 87 4 6½

AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS—*continued.*

(*c*) Table showing average number of Members per month on chief Total Income under chief heads, and amount of Contributions per the Board of Trade Report on Trades Unions, by Mr. John Burnett.

Year.	Number of Members at the end of each Year.	Average Number of Members on Unemployed Benefit.		Average Number of Members on Sick Benefit.		Average Number of Members on Superannuation Benefit.	
		Per Month.	Percentage of Total Number of Members at end of Year.	Per Month.	Percentage of Total Number of Members at end of Year.	Per Month.	Percentage of Total Number of Members at end of Year.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1851	11,829	193	1·6	171	1·4	11	0·1
1852	9,737	823	8·4	145	1·5	26	0·3
1853	10,757	87	0·8	164	1·5	35	0·3
1854	11,617	158	1·3	177	1·5	38	0·3
1855	12,553	441	3·5	210	1·7	42	0·3
1856	13,405	434	3·2	225	1·7	53	0·4
1857	14,299	529	3·7	247	1·7	58	0·4
1858	15,194	1,499	9·8	358	2·4	77	0·5
1859	17,790	610	3·4	307	1·7	110	0·6
1860	20,935	256	1·2	329	1·6	125	0·6
1861	22,862	724	3·2	388	1·7	130	0·6
1862	24,234	1,590	6·5	435	1·8	139	0·6
1863	26,058	1,412	5·4	508	1·9	168	0·6
1864	28,815	658	2·3	524	1·8	196	0·7
1865	30,984	560	1·8	555	1·8	251	0·8
1866	33,007	808	2·4	554	1·6	250	0·7
1867	33,325	2,209	6·6	632	1·9	280	0·8
1868	33,474	2,777	8·3	690	2·0	330	0·9
1869	33,539	2,619	7·8	703	2·1	368	1·1
1870	34,711	1,466	4·2	732	2·1	408	1·2
1871	37,790	510	1·3	740	1·9	416	1·1
1872	41,075	397	0·9	698	1·7	414	1·0
1873	42,382	465	1·1	711	1·7	437	1·0
1874	43,150	674	1·6	785	1·8	449	1·0
1875	44,032	1,077	2·4	862	1·9	487	1·1
1876	44,578	1,627	3·6	906	2·0	541	1·2
1877	45,071	2,118	4·7	934	2·1	604	1·1
1878	45,408	2,974	6·5	987	2·2	696	1·2
1879	44,078	5,879	13·3	1,098	2·4	799	1·8
1880	44,692	2,646	5·9	1,005	2·2	928	2·1
1881	46,101	1,630	3·5	1,042	2·2	1,029	2·2
1882	48,388	889	1·8	1,069	2·2	1,162	2·4
1883	50,418	1,177	2·3	1,117	2·2	1,235	2·4
1884	50,681	2,591	5·1	1,168	2·3	1,338	2·6
1885	51,689	3,240	6 2	1,275	2·4	1,405	2·7
1886	52,019	3,859	7·4	1,291	2·5	1,480	2·8
1887	51,869	3,292	6·3	1,287	2·5	1,553	2 9
1888	53,740	2,259	4·2	1,345	2·5	1,641	3·0
1889	60,728	1,208	1·9	1,352	2·2	1,755	2·8

AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS—*continued.*

benefits, also proportion of same to total number of Members, head, as also Total Expenditure and amount per head, as shown in

Total Annual Income.	Chief Sources of Income.					Annual Expenditure.		
	Contribution, Fines, and Levies.							
	Total Amount.	Amount per Member.		Entrance Fees.	Interest on Funds.	Total Amount.	Amount per Member.	
(8)	(9)	(10)		(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	
£	£	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	£	£	*s.*	*d.*
22,107	19,658	1	13	2¾	2,248	136	11,488	0	19	5
52,606	31,390	3	4	5½	500	154	47,224	4	17	0
24,801	22,719	2	2	2¾	1,926	107	12,492	1	3	2½
27,778	25,553	2	4	0	1,647	343	16,388	1	9	2¾
29,837	27,345	2	3	6¾	1,726	555	23,345	1	17	2¼
32,500	29,750	2	4	4½	1,610	933	24,967	1	17	3
34,898	31,938	2	4	8	1,687	1,089	30,179	2	2	2½
34,123	30,994	2	0	9½	1,693	1,266	51,716	3	8	1
42,333	38,998	2	3	10	2,720	648	36,355	2	0	10¼
52,594	48,806	2	5	8	3,410	848	29,228	1	7	11
56,133	51,642	2	5	2	2,632	1,401	42,939	1	17	6¾
57,783	53,683	2	4	3½	2,331	1,580	63,565	2	12	5½
61,974	57,777	2	4	4	2,444	1,448	62,380	2	7	11
71,056	65,296	2	5	3¾	3,323	1,992	51,518	1	15	10
77,373	70,975	2	5	9¾	3,073	2,756	49,172	1	11	9
83,203	75,436	2	5	8½	3,348	3,658	60,448	1	16	7¼
86,255	78,803	2	7	3½	2,068	3,000	99,061	2	19	5½
83,245	78,276	2	6	2	1,594	2,532	109,309	3	5	3½
82,406	77,549	2	6	2½	1,857	2,274	104,929	3	2	7
85,329	80,336	2	6	4	2,482	1,701	79,039	2	5	6½
91,271	84,609	2	4	9½	4,255	1,738	57,412	1	10	4½
105,377	97,147	3	7	3½	4,871	2,567	63,390	1	10	10¼
109,809	101,983	2	7	11¾	3,605	3,851	65,875	1	11	1
118,556	108,752	2	10	4¾	3,143	5,005	80,489	1	17	3½
120,024	110,665	2	10	3¼	3,019	5,512	94,157	2	2	9¼
120,206	110,724	2	9	6¾	2,715	5,977	109,208	2	9	0½
121,215	110,779	2	9	2	2,508	5,996	120,805	2	13	7¼
123,881	113,485	2	9	11¾	2,653	6,294	146,967	3	4	8½
135,267	126,056	2	17	2¼	2,084	5,626	245,598	5	11	5¼
128,047	120,414	2	13	10½	2,712	4,032	138,629	3	2	0½
132,506	124,109	2	13	10½	3,378	3,641	116,293	2	10	5½
124,408	115,176	2	7	6¾	4,437	3,497	101,971	2	2	3½
134,649	124,504	2	9	4¼	4,297	4,181	123,215	2	9	1½
157,484	147,818	2	18	4	2,898	4,103	172,200	3	7	11¼
144,639	136,513	2	12	9¾	3,088	3,696	187,312	3	12	5
173,937	166,638	3	4	0¾	2,720	2,842	180,964	3	9	4¾
188,805	181,864	3	10	1½	2,578	2,473	175,364	3	7	7¼
189,732	181,683	3	7	7¼	3,709	2,685	157,083	2	18	1
183,651	170,869	2	16	3¼	7,792	3,309	132,642	2	3	8

II.—STEAM-ENGINE MAKERS' SOCIETY.

(*a*) Table showing the Amounts Expended each year from 1853

Year.	Travelling Expenditure.	Average per Member.	Unemployed Expenditure.	Average per Member.	Superannuation Expenditure.	Average per Member.	Contingent Benefit.	Average per Member.
	£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.		
1853	26 9 6	0 4¾	83 0 6	1 3	..	..	..	..
1854	25 6 4	0 3¾	102 9 3	1 4	..	..	..	..
1855	119 1 3	1 5¼	438 18 4	5 3¾	..	..	..	..
1856	188 14 7	2 0½	782 14 11	8 4½	10 9 4	0 1¼	..	..
*1857	182 18 6	2 0¾	745 15 7	8 4½	22 0 0	0 3	..	..
*1858	212 17 2	2 4¾	1,314 10 4	14 7¼	12 8 0	0 2¼	..	..
1859	394 11 1	4 0½	1,854 4 2	18 11½	57 1 0	0 7	..	..
1860	195 15 0	1 10¾	442 0 10	4 3½	71 17 0	0 8½	..	..
1861	132 2 2	1 3	525 4 3	4 11¾	57 12 6	0 6½	..	..
1862	279 17 7	2 6½	1,621 5 2	14 9½	100 2 0	0 10¾	..	..
1863	414 19 2	3 9	2,421 11 8	21 10¾	157 1 0	1 5	..	..
1864	242 19 11	2 0½	1,056 7 2	8 10	201 3 6	1 8	..	..
1865	84 16 11	0 8	553 1 4	4 4½	240 13 2	1 10¾	..	..
1866	108 3 2	0 9½	583 11 2	4 3½	254 15 8	1 10½	..	..
1867	138 15 8	0 11½	1,236 3 1	8 8¼	259 8 0	1 9¾	..	..
1868	334 8 7	2 3¾	3,278 11 7	22 9¾	324 14 8	2 3	..	..
1869	267 19 10	1 10¾	3,363 0 2	23 11½	320 15 0	2 3¼	..	..
1870	266 3 10	1 10¾	2,640 12 8	18 11½	333 16 2	2 9	..	..
1871	88 11 9	0 6¾	913 15 10	5 11½	444 19 0	2 10¾	..	..
1872	48 0 6	0 3¼	543 1 2	3 2¼	473 8 2	2 9¼	..	..
1873	61 7 3	0 4	739 2 1	4 2¾	448 14 2	2 6¾	..	..
1874	67 16 6	0 4¼	1,179 17 5	6 4½	440 17 2	2 4½	..	..
†1874	67 2 9	0 4¼	563 0 2	2 11¾	282 2 0	1 5⅜	This Fund was created by Revision of Laws in 1874.	
1875	116 10 5	0 7	1,409 9 7	7 3½	586 7 0	3 0¼	£ 166 s. 4 d. 8	s. d. 0 10½
1876	138 1 10	0 8	2,165 14 8	10 11¾	747 8 4	3 9½	177 0 0	0 10¾
1877	152 15 4	0 8¼	2,964 4 5	14 4¾	722 4 10	3 6	139 10 6	0 8
1878	331 4 1	1 6¾	5,242 6 7	24 8	769 16 10	3 7½	221 8 0	1 0½
1879	145 12 5	0 8½	8,401 16 6	41 3¼	869 17 10	4 3¼	1,225 4 3	6 0
1880	140 15 1	0 8	3,431 10 1	16 7	1,086 9 2	5 3	120 15 8	0 7
1881	125 3 8	0 6¾	2,492 12 8	11 4¼	1,295 15 2	5 10¾	70 14 2	0 3¾
1882	75 2 0	0 3¾	1,472 18 2	6 5	1,395 5 0	6 0¾	20 5 4	0 1½
1883	92 14 11	0 4½	1,876 17 8	7 10½	1,343 6 4	5 7½	125 10 10	0 6¼
1884	86 9 0	0 4	3,061 14 5	12 5½	1,318 19 4	5 4¼	83 4 2	0 4
1885	160 11 11	0 7⅛	4,886 9 6	19 8½	1,438 7 4	5 8	138 10 10	0 6½
1886	83 15 2	0 3⅝	5,822 17 5	22 11	1,518 0 4	5 11½	136 16 10	0 6½
1887	92 6 8	0 4¼	5,988 15 11	23 6¾	1,714 6 2	6 9	1,051 1 0	4 1½
1888	164 17 11	0 7⅞	2,883 6 0	11 1⅜	1,802 9 6	6 11⅜	115 0 0	0 5¼
1889	93 15 8	0 4	1,299 9 7	4 8¾	1,817 19 2	6 7¼	121 1 3	0 5¼
	5,948 15 10		80,382 2 3		22,990 9 10		3,982 7 6	

* The 1857 Annual Report was for one year ending December 25th, 1857, and the one following was for six months ending June 30th, 1858. The two Reports were issued in one volume, the former with no tables attached, the latter with average expenditure only.

† The Report, 1874, was for seven months only, the financial year having previously ended on May 31st, 1874, but to comply with the Trades Union Act the accounts had to close on December 31st in each year.

STEAM-ENGINE MAKERS' SOCIETY—*continued.*

in the various Benefits, and the Average Cost per Member.

Sick Benefit.	Average per Member.	Funeral Benefit.	Average per Member.	Miscellaneous or Working Expenses.	Average per Member.	Benevolent Grants.	Disabled Compensation.	Year.
£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.		£ s.	
571 1 9	8 8¼	150 0 0	2 3¼	464 3 5	7 0¾		100 0	1853
561 1 4	7 4	135 0 0	1 9	860 19 9	7 8½		65 16	1854
771 17 4	9 3½	225 0 0	2 8½	1,062 6 2	11 7		..	1855
763 1 1	8 2	160 0 0	1 8½	670 11 11	7 2¼		200 0	1856
646 16 2	7 3	185 0 0	2 1	708 10 0	7 9½		300 0	*1857
301 8 8	3 3¾	40 0 0	0 8¼	769 8 0	8 5		..	*1858
863 6 7	8 9¾	210 0 0	2 1¾	1,093 10 6	11 2		200 0	1859
1,005 10 10	9 9½	351 10 10	3 5	1,100 7 3	10 8¾		400 0	1860
913 0 9	8 8	290 0 0	2 9	954 0 11	9 0¾		300 0	1861
909 5 1	8 3½	220 0 0	2 0	971 12 11	8 10½		200 0	1862
1,007 2 8	9 1¼	247 0 0	2 2¾	1,054 18 2	9 6¼		300 0	1863
1,213 8 1	10 1¾	210 0 0	1 9	953 16 10	7 11¼		..	1864
1,121 12 2	8 10¾	385 0 0	3 0½	990 2 1	7 10¼	£ s. d.	300 0	1865
1,295 12 9	9 6½	330 0 0	2 5	997 7 4	7 4½	8 1 0	200 0	1866
1,454 10 2	10 2¾	389 18 6	2 8¾	1,041 13 0	7 3¾	32 15 0	300 0	1867
1,466 6 6	10 2¼	545 0 0	3 9¾	1,095 3 11	7 7¼	53 1 9	300 0	1868
1,609 12 11	11 5¼	565 0 0	4 0¼	1,112 17 7	7 11	46 4 6	500 0	1869
1,553 16 6	11 1¾	500 0 0	3 7	1,171 10 0	8 5	37 15 9	400 0	1870
1,458 2 3	9 6	435 0 0	2 10	1,067 14 6	6 11½	39 6 6	200 0	1871
1,564 1 10	9 2¼	475 0 0	2 9½	1,280 1 0	7 6¼	41 5 7	300 0	1872
1,522 5 10	8 7¼	481 9 0	2 8¾	1,511 0 5	8 6¾	44 16 0	200 0	1873
1 432 7 4	7 8¾	580 0 0	3 1½	1,282 9 0	6 11	32 14 6	200 0	1874
912 13 0	4 10	360 0 0	1 10½	885 4 9	4 8½	30 3 2	100 0	†1874
1,868 12 6	9 7¾	580 0 0	2 11¾	1,344 6 2	6 11¼	83 0 5	100 0	1875
1,910 1 11	9 8¼	605 0 0	3 0¾	1,273 3 7	6 5½	93 12 2	200 0	1876
1,762 12 6	8 6½	695 0 0	3 4½	1,345 11 10	6 6¼	106 13 5	..	1877
2,121 13 0	9 11¾	597 3 4	2 9½	1,425 14 6	6 8½	129 16 11	500 0	1878
2,295 6 6	11 3¼	617 0 0	3 0¼	1,510 15 5	7 5	212 10 0	120 0	1879
2,263 10 10	10 11¼	589 16 0	2 10	1,397 1 0	6 9	67 0 0	300 0	1880
2,249 10 3	10 3	580 0 0	2 7½	1,436 3 2	6 6½	55 0 0	100 0	1881
2,219 2 2	9 8	665 0 0	2 10¾	1,469 9 8	6 4¾	41 0 0	330 0	1882
2,532 12 6	10 7½	695 0 0	2 11	1,473 7 3	6 2¼	47 3 4	400 0	1883
2,703 14 9	11 0	665 0 0	2 8½	1,518 11 11	6 2	73 0 0	200 0	1884
2,709 19 10	10 8¼	665 0 0	2 7½	1,513 9 9	5 11¾	72 0 0	200 0	1885
2,717 13 0	10 8¼	880 0 0	3 5½	1,710 7 0	6 8¾	70 10 0	200 0	1886
2,729 2 3	10 8¾	745 0 0	2 11	1,597 13 1	6 3¼	48 10 0	100 0	1887
2,787 18 9	10 9½	765 0 0	2 11½	1,698 9 7	6 6¼	84 10 0	100 0	1888
2,802 10 2	10 2¼	1011 0 0	3 8	1,801 4 5	6 6¼	56 0 0	200 0	1889
60,592 2 6		17,824 17 8		45,614 16 4		1,606 10 0	8,115 16	

This Fund was created by Revision of Laws in 1865.

TOTALS.

	£ s. d.
Travelling Benefit	5,948 15 10
Unemployed Benefit	80,382 2 3
Superannuation Benefit..	22,990 9 10
Contingent Benefit	3,982 7 6
Sick Benefit..	60,592 2 6
Funeral Benefit	17,824 17 8
Benevolent Grants	1,606 10 0
Disabled Compensation	8,115 16 0
	£201,443 1 7

STEAM-ENGINE MAKERS' SOCIETY—*continued.*

(*b*) Table showing the Total Income and Expenditure each year from 1853, with the worth of Society, also Number of Members and Branches.

Year.	Number of Branches.	Number of Members.	Total Income.	Total Expenditure.	Total Funds at the end of each Year.	Amount per Member.
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1853	38	1,313	2,953 17 8	2,014 9 0	2,900 19 2	2 4 2
1854	47	1,529	3,134 9 5	1,780 2 3	4,216 10 11	2 15 1½
1855	48	1,662	3,450 5 9	2,617 3 2	5,028 7 9	3 0 6
1856	53	1,867	3,955 19 6	3,262 9 10	5,669 8 2	3 0 8¾
*1857	57	not given	..	..	..	..
*1858	59	1,776	5,350 19 7	5,798 15 9	4,385 0 8	2 9 4½
1859	59	1,958	4,039 12 11	4,712 2 1	4,154 16 11	2 2 5½
1860	59	2,050	4,993 0 10	4,331 10 7	4,780 7 8	2 6 7½
1861	59	2,107	5,037 1 0	3,929 5 1	5,689 5 5	2 14 0
1862	59	2,190	5,293 17 4	5,139 3 6	5,717 8 7	2 11 11½
1863	60	2,213	5,307 0 8	6,350 16 0	4,649 3 5	2 2 0
1864	60	2,294	5,265 7 5	4,600 4 11	5,288 19 0	2 4 2
1865	60	2,521	5,590 2 2	4,213 8 2	6,553 13 3	2 12 4
1866	64	2,712	6,141 15 8	4,453 6 9	8,218 19 9	3 2 2
1867	65	2,843	6,574 16 11	5,501 4 9	9,285 19 10	3 5 3¾
1868	65	2,873	6,824 2 2	8,314 0 5	7,847 16 2	2 14 7½
1869	66	2,805	7,091 1 11	8,743 5 5	6,006 7 0	2 2 9¾
1870	67	2,819	6,552 14 0	7,765 7 1	4,793 15 6	1 14 5½
1871	70	3,063	6,843 18 4	5,462 10 5	6,130 8 10	2 0 3¾
1872	74	3,392	7,349 2 4	5,571 16 11	7,969 14 8	2 7 4
1873	77	3,527	7,907 14 4	5,720 2 5	10,013 19 7	2 17 4
1874	80	3,701	8,359 14 2	6 327 4 4	12,158 1 3	3 7 3
†1874	80	3,768	4,417 2 10	3,200 5 10	13,535 5 5	3 11 4
1875	80	3,871	7,975 2 5	6,403 1 3	15,107 6 7	3 17 0
1876	81	3,938	8,497 7 10	7,474 10 8	16,130 3 9	4 1 4
1877	83	4,124	8,422 16 9	8,088 13 6	16,464 7 0	3 19 9
1878	85	4,247	8,994 0 3	11,519 16 10	13,938 10 4	3 5 0
1879	84	4,071	10,617 12 1	15,794 13 11	8,761 8 6	2 2 5
1880	85	4,134	8,722 11 9	9,552 19 0	7,931 1 3	1 18 0
1881	88	4,387	9,391 17 11	8,551 17 11	8,771 1 3	2 0 0
1882	88	4,591	9,238 7 8	7,941 4 10	10,068 4 0	2 3 10¼
1883	89	4,762	9,870 5 11	8,797 9 2	11,141 0 9	2 7 0
1884	88	4,910	9,870 16 8	9,940 2 2	11,071 15 3	2 5 1
1885	88	5,062	11,335 16 1	11,972 7 3	10,435 4 1	2 1 2¾
1886	90	5,079	12,515 2 4	13,292 6 7	9,657 19 9	1 18 0¼
1887	90	5,080	14,838 0 11	14,266 13 8	10,229 7 1	2 0 3¼
1888	90	5,165	13,909 13 5	10,567 17 10	13,571 2 8	2 12 6½
1889	93	5,500	15,302 16 7	9,516 9 6	19,357 9 9	3 10 4½

* In 1857 a detailed Report of Expenditure was printed from January 1st to December 31st, no tables of Income or Expenditure being given; but in 1858 a Report was printed for six months ending June 30th, which gave the average payment per member for the various benefits as paid. The total Income and Expenditure here shown for 1858 is from January 1st, 1857, to June 30th, 1858.

† The second Report for 1874 was from June 1st to December 1st, the dates of making out the accounts being altered, to comply with the Trades Union Act, the Society being registered that year.

(*a*) Amounts paid each year for the various Benefits, commencing 1867, and the Balance at the end of each year.

Year.	No. of Members.	Sickness.		Funerals.		Surgeons.		Travellers.		Home Donation.		Super-annuation.		Fares to Jobs.		Accident Benefit.		Disputes.		Balance at the end of each year.
		Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£
1867	7,405	4,907	13 1½	970	2 7½	1,220	3 3½	10,546	28 5¾	426	1 2	507	1 4½	32	1	140	0 4½	803	2 2¼	1,493
1868	6,311	4,058	11 10	944	2 9	1,047	3 0½	2,256	6 7	257	0 9	643	1 10½	30	1	40	0 1½	67	0 2½	873
1869	6,298	4,184	13 3½	1,138	3 7½	980	3 1½	1,501	4 9	281	0 10¾	829	2 7½	13	0½	240	0 9	27	0 1	5,253
1870	7,261	3,947	11 7¾	1,064	3 1¾	1,076	3 2	1,773	5 2¾	154	0 5½	1,146	3 4¾	36	1¼	220	0 7¾	58	0 2	9,169
1871	8,983	4,312	11 7½	1,160	2 8¾	1,268	3 1¼	1,358	3 4	109	0 3	1,378	3 3	30	0¾	240	0 7	1,385	3 4¾	13,974
1872	11,528	4,284	8 4½	1,179	2 3½	1,667	3 3	506	0 11¾	133	0 3	1,192	2 3¾	118	2¼	225	0 5¼	861	1 8	25,129
1873	13,137	4,622	7 5¾	1,418	2 3½	1,969	3 2¼	1,091	1 9	97	0 1¾	1,122	1 9¾	141	2¾	180	0 3½	281	0 5¼	39,178
1874	14,715	5,676	7 8½	1,596	2 2	2,249	3 0½	2,793	3 9½	322	0 5¼	1,188	1 7½	127	2	15	0 0½	1,060	1 7½	52,086
1875	16,191	8,542	11 6¼	1,920	2 5¾	2,508	3 3¾	11,043	14 3½	932	1 2½	1,145	1 5½	107	1¾	400	0 6¼	4,660	6 0½	51,212
1876	17,469	9,542	11 4¼	1,897	2 3	2,736	3 3	13,039	15 6	4,756	5 7	1,067	1 3	110	1½	1,100	1 3½	2,991	3 6¼	45,337
1877	19,660	9,792	10 3¼	1,929	2 0	2,934	2 1	12,446	13 1	2,256	2 4½	1,219	1 3½	116	1½	1,500	1 10	13,805	14 6½	37,280
1878	18,584	11,661	12 6½	2,137	2 3¼	2,959	3 2½	19,528	22 1	1,696	1 9¾	1,324	1 5	125	1½	1,800	1 11	6,966	7 5¾	28,519
1879	16,988	12,171	14 8¾	2,379	2 9½	2,558	3 0	21,242	25 0	10,734	12 7½	1,580	1 10½	61	0¾	201	0 2¾	7,109	8 4¼	9,195
1880	17,688	10,452	11 9¾	2,261	2 6¾	2,445	2 9	11,078	12 6	8,369	9 5½	1,841	2 0¾	184	2¼	1,181	1 4	4,089	4 7½	23,294
1881	20,676	8,809	8 8½	2,384	2 3¼	2,735	2 1¾	441	0 5¼	1,764	1 8¾	2,305	2 3	247	2¼	1,260	1 2	711	0 8¼	50,277
1882	27,408	11,077	9 3	2,626	2 1¾	3,366	2 9	706	0 6	28	..	2,574	2 1¾	302	3	1,350	1 1¼	1,652	1 4½	81,344
1883	28,477	13,513	9 5¾	3,595	2 6¼	3,770	2 7¾	434	0 3¼	3,171	2 2½	2,797	1 10¾	354	2¾	1,650	1 1¾	2,778	1 11¼	108,546
1884	28,730	18,189	12 7¾	3,657	2 6½	3,898	2 8¼			57,205	39 9¾	3,086	2 1¾	169	1¼	2,365	1 7¾	5,559	3 10¼	60,066
1885	28,212	18,918	13 4¾	3,654	2 7	3,734	2 7¾			42,921	30 5	3,370	2 4½	145	1	1,585	1 1¼	3,593	2 6½	38 317
1886	26,776	17,479	13 0½	3,441	2 6¾	3,441	2 6¾			37,280	27 10	4,078	3 0½	134	1	2,908	2 2	1,686	1 3½	21,895
1887	25,100	17,165	13 8	3,425	2 6¾	3,374	2 6¾			22,165	17 8	4,657	3 8½	149	1¼	1,815	1 5¼	1,131	0 10¾	25,001
1888	26,545	15,161	11 5½	2,957	2 2¾	3,498	2 7½			7,151	5 9	4,919	3 8¾	225	2	3,090	2 3¾	4,533	3 4½	53,028
1889	29,993	15,097	10 0¼	3,993	2 7¾	4,119	2 8½			3,486	2 3¾	5,017	3 4¼	452	3½	3,155	2 1	4,450	3 0	100,896

SUMMARY.—Sick Benefit, £231,840; Funerals, £51,579; Surgeons, £59,438; Home Donation and Travelling, £308,507; Superannuation, £49,257; Fares to Situations, £3,307; Accident Benefit, £26,660. Total—Benevolent Purposes, £730,580. Total for Disputes, £70,255. Grand Total, £800,835.

IV.—IRONFOUNDERS.

(*a*) Table showing Amounts paid, and Averages per Member, for Donation and Superannuation each year from 1840 to 1890.

Year.	Number of Branches.	Number of Members.	Donation.		Superannuation.	
			Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.	Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.
			£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.
1840	59	3,498	5,745 10 0	32 10½	168 16 9	0 11½
1841	55	2,962	4,384 9 4	29 7¼	141 16 3	0 11½
1842	54	2,427	2,899 13 3	23 10¾	111 6 6	0 11
1843	53	2,745	1,898 3 6	13 10	134 8 0	0 9½
1844	53	3,461	1,068 1 8	6 2	125 19 0	0 7¼
1845	56	4,216	551 6 10	2 7½	124 2 0	0 6
1846	56	4,463	1,267 16 9	5 8¼	96 8 0	0 5¼
1847	58	4,638	8,694 19 3	37 6	202 8 0	0 10½
1848	65	4,343	21,160 4 8	97 5½	239 10 4	1 1¼
1849	59	3,958	12,821 17 6	64 9½	223 1 4	1 1½
1850	62	4,073	6,889 13 10	33 10	259 8 0	1 3¼
1851	61	4,585	5,247 16 11	22 10¾	239 13 0	1 0½
1852	62	4,445	13,137 7 10	59 1½	242 11 0	1 1¼
1853	60	4,984	2,929 12 5	11 9	260 7 1	1 0½
1854	66	5,335	4,860 9 2	18 2¾	790 8 5	2 11½
1855	66	5,685	10,149 4 3	35 8½	891 16 0	3 1¾
1856	68	6,116	9,467 17 4	30 11½	925 4 0	3 0¼
1857	71	6,421	10,075 0 6	31 4½	1,108 0 10	3 5½
1858	73	6,637	17,483 14 4	52 8¼	1,150 1 6	3 5½
1859	75	7,317	6,410 16 1	17 6¼	1,052 13 6	2 10½
1860	78	7,973	3,941 12 7	9 10¾	962 11 10	2 5
1861	81	8,229	12,053 2 9	29 3½	975 9 0	2 4½
1862	83	8,458	19,823 5 11	46 10½	1,020 15 2	2 5
1863	87	8,840	14,651 12 3	33 1¾	1,100 13 10	2 6
1864	92	9,723	9,223 8 10	18 11¼	1,291 16 0	2 8
1865	97	10,604	8,217 0 11	15 6	1,298 19 5	2 5½
1866	106	11,121	14,876 4 11	26 9	1,330 7 6	2 4¾
1867	105	10,839	35,272 1 1	65 1	1,405 11 8	2 7
1868	104	9,853	31,592 2 5	64 1½	1,717 9 1	3 5¾
1869	103	8,990	24,886 13 4	55 4½	1,796 16 6	4 0
1870	101	8,994	13,539 9 4	30 1¼	1,769 17 3	3 11¼
1871	99	10,019	5,447 0 9	10 10½	1,792 9 7	3 7
1872	100	10,634	2,887 5 8	5 5¼	2,336 11 10	4 2½
1873	104	11,512	7,679 0 7	13 4	2,171 19 2	3 9¼
1874	106	11,925	10,712 2 11	17 11½	2,772 15 0	4 7¾
1875	107	12,336	11,186 19 1	18 1¾	2,998 1 6	4 10¼
1876	110	12,627	17,689 3 6	28 0¼	3,307 7 10	5 2¾
1877	112	12,612	25,337 10 5	40 2¼	3,452 1 6	5 5¾
1878	113	12,620	38,486 14 7	61 0	3,653 12 0	5 9½
1879	112	12,276	57,510 18 0	93 8¼	3,727 4 0	6 0¾
1880	111	11,580	24,243 19 0	41 10½	4,144 14 10	7 2
1881	111	11,201	18,310 8 0	32 8¼	4,537 4 8	8 1¼
1882	108	11,448	10,466 14 2	18 3½	4,786 14 3	8 4¼
1883	109	11,917	11,461 4 4	19 2½	5,166 2 7	8 8
1884	113	12,415	18,847 18 3	30 4¼	5,715 19 7	9 2½
1885	115	12,376	26,970 0 9	43 7	6,215 17 10	10 0½
1886	114	12,037	32,856 2 8	54 7	7,182 5 8	11 11¼
1887	114	11,718	21,801 2 4	37 2½	7,692 10 11	13 1½
1888	115	12,202	12,629 9 10	20 8½	8,028 10 9	13 2
1889	114	13,805	5,311 10 2	7 8¼	7,935 1 7	11 5¼

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*b*) Table showing Amounts paid, and Averages per Member, for Sick, Funeral, and Accidents, each year from 1840 to 1890.

Year.	Number of Members.	Sick.		Funerals.		Accidents.	
		Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.	Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.	Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.
		£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.
1840	3,498	2,444 3 10	13 11½	314 0 6	1 9½	..	..
1841	2,962	2,721 0 0	18 4¼	596 7 3	4 0½	..	..
1842	2,427	1,192 4 2	9 10¼	370 14 0	3 0½	..	..
1843	2,745	929 7 1	6 8	328 0 0	2 4¾	..	..
1844	3,461	1,186 8 3	6 10½	249 0 0	1 5¼	..	..
1845	4,216	1,367 19 8	6 5¾	295 1 6	1 4¾	300 10 10	1 5
1846	4,463	2,055 7 6	9 2½	416 0 0	1 10¼	307 8 9	1 4½
1847	4,638	2,681 12 7	11 7½	549 0 0	2 4¾	607 6 0	2 7½
1848	4,343	2,662 0 3	16 10½	577 16 5	2 8	300 0 0	1 4½
1849	3,958	1,225 8 8	6 2¼	482 0 0	2 5½	211 15 2	1 0¾
1850	4,073	1,471 10 4	7 2¾	667 14 7	3 3½	263 1 11	1 3½
1851	4,585	1,696 6 5	7 4¾	501 11 6	2 2½	142 7 10	0 7½
1852	4,445	1,696 6 7	7 7½	465 0 0	2 1	452 0 10	2 0½
1853	4,984	1,611 19 1	6 5¾	520 0 0	2 1	351 11 0	1 5
1854	5,335	1,747 7 8	6 6½	603 10 0	2 3¼	50 0 0	0 2¼
1855	5,685	1,861 9 7	6 6½	544 0 0	1 11	261 8 0	0 11
1856	6,116	2,073 16 10	6 9¼	571 0 0	1 10½	56 13 0	0 2¼
1857	6,421	2,296 5 3	7 1¾	508 0 0	1 7	814 4 8	2 6½
1858	6,637	2,237 17 9	6 9	660 0 0	2 0	310 18 10	0 11¼
1859	7,317	2,264 15 7	6 2¼	644 0 0	1 9	490 5 1	1 4
1860	7,973	2,617 14 9	6 6¾	629 9 0	1 6¾	251 7 0	0 7½
1861	8,229	2,748 17 0	6 8¼	656 0 0	1 7¼	678 10 1	1 7¾
1862	8,458	2,883 0 4	6 9¾	712 0 0	1 8½	679 10 3	1 7¼
1863	8,840	3,325 4 10	7 6¼	878 11 0	1 11¾	763 17 9	1 8¾
1864	9,728	4,611 12 0	9 5¾	1,374 0 0	2 10	1,666 11 3	3 4
1865	10,604	4,813 5 8	9 1	1,300 0 0	2 5½	953 14 0	1 9½
1866	11,121	5,205 7 2	9 4¼	1,600 0 0	2 10½	1,161 19 1	2 1
1867	10,839	4,908 3 9	9 0¾	1,257 0 0	2 3¾	1,717 3 11	3 2
1868	9,853	4,202 10 2	8 6¼	1,421 0 4	2 10½	51 2 10	0 1¼
1869	8,990	3,733 13 8	8 3¾	1,355 0 0	3 0¼	82 9 4	0 0¾
1870	8,904	3,742 9 5	8 3¾	1,460 0 0	3 3	585 0 0	1 3½
1871	10,019	4,564 2 3	9 1¼	1,320 0 0	2 7½	2,482 11 9	4 11½
1872	10,664	5,153 1 4	9 8½	1,345 0 0	2 6¼	914 9 5	1 8¾
1873	11,512	5,216 15 7	9 0¾	1,800 0 0	3 1½	1,437 9 7	2 6
1874	11,925	5,940 15 1	9 11¼	1,780 0 0	2 11¾	1,297 8 11	2 2
1875	12,336	6,607 18 1	10 8½	2,010 0 0	3 3	1,277 0 4	2 0¾
1876	12,627	6,675 7 2	10 7	1,810 0 0	2 10½	1,858 5 10	2 11¼
1877	12,612	6,337 13 2	10 0¾	2,010 0 0	3 2¼	943 10 5	1 6
1878	12,620	6,520 18 11	10 4	2,005 0 0	3 2	1,619 14 0	2 6¾
1879	12,276	6,260 17 5	10 2¼	2,160 0 0	3 6½	943 18 7	1 6½
1880	11,580	6,106 5 3	10 6½	1,565 0 0	2 8½	1,130 10 3	1 11½
1881	11,201	6,440 17 1	11 6	2,155 0 0	3 10¼	1,099 3 10	1 11¼
1882	11,418	6,033 1 0	10 6½	1,720 0 0	3 0	987 16 7	1 8¾
1883	11,917	6,726 9 6	11 3½	2,020 0 0	3 4¾	731 19 7	1 2¾
1884	12,415	6,456 5 6	10 4¾	1,920 0 0	3 1	654 2 2	1 0¾
1885	12,376	6,404 19 2	10 4¼	2,305 0 0	3 8¾	174 1 4	0 3½
1886	12,037	6,231 1 3	10 4¼	2,060 13 2	3 5	268 18 0	0 5¼
1887	11,718	6,192 7 6	10 6¾	2,306 12 0	3 11¼	612 16 2	1 0½
1888	12,202	6,658 12 2	10 11	2,185 0 0	3 7	165 1 4	0 3¼
1889	13,805	6,441 7 6	9 4	2,117 10 0	3 0¾	770 18 0	1 1½

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*c*) Table showing Amounts paid, and Averages per Member, for Emigration, Benevolent Grants, and Dispute Benefit, each year from 1840 to 1890.

Year.	Number of Members.	Emigration.		Benevolent Grants.		Dispute Allowance.	
		Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.	Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.	Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.
		£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	s. d.
1840	3,498	..	..	..	..	307 13 2	1 9
1841	2,962	..	..	..	..	44 2 10	0 3½
1842	2,427	..	..	..	..	578 19 6	4 9½
1843	2,745	..	..	..	..	321 17 1	2 4½
1844	3,461	..	..	..	..	2,499 14 10	14 5½
1845	4,216	..	..	5 0 0	0 0¼	991 18 10	4 8½
1846	4,463	..	..	..	..	455 7 4	2 0½
1847	4,638	..	..	..	..	1,978 15 5	8 6½
1848	4,343	..	..	..	..	1,485 9 3	6 10
1849	3,958	..	..	..	..	166 13 1	0 10
1850	4,073	..	..	..	..	402 9 4	1 11¾
1851	4,585	..	..	..	..	472 17 2	2 0¾
1852	4,445	..	..	..	..	802 15 0	3 7¼
1853	4,984	..	..	..	..	232 7 9	0 11¼
1854	5,335	..	..	..	..	206 14 0	0 9¼
1855	5,685	52 18 10	0 2¼	..	..	254 14 3	0 10¾
1856	6,116	32 14 0	0 1¼	..	..	132 3 2	0 5¼
1857	6,421	283 7 0	0 10½	..	..	445 14 3	1 4¾
1858	6,637	..	..	..	..	589 5 4	1 9¼
1859	7,317	..	..	34 0 7	0 1¼	181 13 2	0 4¾
1860	7,973	..	..	344 4 11	0 10¾	155 8 0	0 4¾
1861	8,229	..	..	..	..	626 18 4	1 6¾
1862	8,458	..	..	..	..	374 12 7	0 10¾
1863	8,840	..	..	..	..	163 4 0	0 4½
1864	9,728	414 3 3	0 10¼	115 4 6	0 2¾	234 17 0	0 5¾
1865	10,604	548 12 9	1 0¼	145 0 0	0 3½	194 10 5	0 4½
1866	11,121	533 1 2	0 11½	115 1 8	0 2½	344 3 5	0 7½
1867	10,839	1,278 19 6	2 4¼	62 2 6	0 1¼	2,347 7 9	4 4
1868	9,853	192 5 2	0 4¾	..	..	576 11 7	1 2
1869	8,990	15 2 7	0 0¼	..	..	187 10 5	0 5
1870	8,994	12 6 0	0 0¼	25 0 0	0 0¾	49 8 4	0 1¼
1871	10,019	..	..	60 10 0	0 1¾	287 16 3	0 6¾
1872	10,634	..	..	166 18 6	0 3¾	40 0 1	0 0¾
1873	11,512	1,124 16 1	1 11¼	150 10 0	0 3¼	316 10 6	0 6¼
1874	11,925	223 16 7	0 4½	1,137 17 0	1 11	89 9 11	0 1¾
1875	12,336	..	..	180 0 0	0 3½	286 4 5	0 5½
1876	12,627	..	..	143 10 0	0 2¾	198 17 11	0 3¾
1877	12,612	..	..	145 10 0	0 2¾	689 18 9	1 1¼
1878	12,620	..	..	185 10 0	0 3½	738 2 0	1 2
1879	12,276	..	..	70 10 0	0 1½	5,386 12 7	9 7
1880	11,580	..	..	21 0 0	0 0½	309 3 11	0 6½
1881	11,201	..	..	43 5 0	0 1	204 5 6	0 5½
1882	11,448	..	..	106 0 0	0 2¼	214 15 6	0 4½
1883	11,917	..	..	95 10 0	0 2	473 16 5	0 9½
1884	12,415	..	..	100 0 0	0 2	319 14 2	0 6
1885	12,376	..	..	50 0 0	0 1	553 17 2	0 10¾
1886	12,037	..	..	18 0 0	0 0¼	507 7 7	0 10
1887	11,718	..	..	12 10 0	0 0¼	99 7 8	0 2
1888	12,202	..	..	16 10 0	0 0¼	130 10 2	0 2¼
1889	13,805	..	..	90 10 0	1 2¼	150 15 4	0 2¾

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*d*) Table showing Amounts paid, and Averages per Member, for Working Expenses, and the Total Expenditure each year from 1840 to 1890.

Year.	Number of Members.	All other Expenses.		Total Expenditure.	
		Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.	Total Amount.	Average per Member per Year.
		£ s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1840	3,498	2,477 4 2	14 2	11,457 8 5	3 5 6
1841	2,962	1,780 10 6	12 0¼	9,668 6 2	3 5 3¼
1842	2,427	943 11 6	7 9¼	6,096 9 0	2 10 2¾
1843	2,745	495 0 6	3 7¼	4,106 16 3	1 9 11
1844	3,461	520 0 0	3 0	5,649 3 9	1 12 7¾
1845	4,216	1,334 2 10	6 4	4,970 2 6	1 3 7
1846	4,463	1,497 1 7	6 8¼	6,095 9 11	1 7 3¾
1847	4,638	918 8 1	3 11½	15,632 9 4	3 7 5
1848	4,343	1,284 2 10	6 4	27,709 3 10	6 7 7¼
1849	3,958	1,280 0 4	6 5½	16,410 16 2	4 2 11
1850	4,073	2,041 10 0	10 0¼	11,995 8 0	2 18 10¾
1851	4,585	1,512 7 7	6 7¼	9,813 0 6	2 2 9½
1852	4,445	1,316 17 4	5 10½	18,112 18 9	4 1 6
1853	4,984	2,102 9 1	8 5¼	8,007 6 7	1 12 1½
1854	5,335	2,103 9 11	7 10¾	10,361 19 2	1 18 10¼
1855	5,685	2,377 1 11	8 4¼	16,392 12 11	2 17 8
1856	6,116	2,672 6 0	8 8¾	15,931 14 4	2 12 1
1857	6,421	1,668 8 1	5 2¼	17,199 0 8	2 13 6¾
1858	6,637	2,146 13 6	6 5¾	24,578 11 3	3 14 0¾
1859	7,317	2,910 6 7	7 11½	13,988 10 8	1 18 2¾
1860	7,973	2,687 7 11	6 9	11,589 16 1	1 9 0¾
1861	8,229	2,356 17 0	5 8¾	20,095 14 2	2 8 10
1862	8,458	3,844 5 9	9 1	29,337 10 1	3 9 4½
1863	8,840	2,989 7 4	6 9¼	23,872 11 0	2 14 0
1864	9,723	3,413 3 6	7 0½	22,344 16 4	2 5 11½
1865	10,604	3,054 4 6	5 9	20,525 7 8	1 18 8½
1866	11,121	5,293 10 2	8 10	30,459 15 2	2 14 9¼
1867	10,839	4,291 0 10	7 11	52,539 11 1	4 16 11¼
1868	8,853	4,197 16 4	8 6¼	43,950 18 0	4 9 2½
1869	8,990	2,983 18 1	6 7¾	34,991 4 0	3 17 10
1870	8,994	4,872 13 10	10 10	26,056 4 2	2 17 11¼
1871	10,019	3,217 10 5	6 5	19,172 1 0	1 18 3¼
1872	10,634	2,603 5 4	4 10¾	15,446 12 2	1 9 0½
1873	11,512	2,967 6 5	5 1¾	22,864 8 0	1 19 8¾
1874	11,925	3,188 17 4	5 4½	27,143 2 9	2 5 6¼
1875	12,336	3,462 5 7	5 7¼	28,008 9 0	2 5 5
1876	12,627	3,256 5 7	5 2	34,938 17 10	2 15 4
1877	12,612	3,508 11 1	5 6¾	42,424 15 4	3 7 3¼
1878	12,620	3,769 18 5	5 11¾	56,979 4 11	4 10 1¾
1879	12,276	4,029 6 0	6 6¾	80,089 6 8	6 10 5¾
1880	11,580	3,780 9 5	6 6¼	41,301 2 8	3 11 4
1881	11,201	3,744 19 6	6 8¼	36,535 3 8	3 5 2¾
1882	11,448	3,722 16 9	6 6	28,037 18 3	2 8 11¼
1883	11,917	3,859 5 1	6 5¾	30,533 18 6	2 11 3
1884	11,415	3,359 18 2	5 5	37,373 17 10	3 0 2½
1885	12,376	3,207 1 5	5 2¼	45,880 17 8	3 14 1½
1886	12,037	3,093 13 0	5 1¾	52,218 1 4	4 6 9¼
1887	11,718	3,144 8 6	5 4¼	41,861 15 1	3 11 5¼
1888	12,202	3,166 5 0	5 2¼	32,979 19 3	2 14 0¾
1889	13,805	3,187 11 4	4 8¼	26,005 3 11	1 17 8

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*e*) Table showing Income and Expenditure for, and Cash in hand at end of, each year from 1840 to 1890.

Year.	Number of Members.	Income.			Expenditure.			Cash in hand end of Year.		
		Total Amount.			Average per Member per Year.			Total Amount.			Average per Member.		
		£	s.	d.	s.	d.	£ s. d.	s.	d.	£ s. d.	£	s.	d.
1840	3,498	8,529	10	5	48	9¼	11,457 8 5	65	6	907 0 5	0	5	2¼
1841	2,962	9,061	5	9	61	2¼	9,668 6 2	65	3¼	..	..		
1842	2,427	6,096	9	0	50	2¾	6,096 9 0	50	2¾	..	..		
1843	2,745	4,106	16	3	29	11	4,106 16 3	29	11	..	..		
1844	3,461	12,210	0	6	70	6¾	5,649 3 9	32	7¾	6,560 16 9	1	17	11
1845	4,216	9,978	3	1	47	3¾	4,970 2 6	23	7	12,931 17 5	3	1	4¼
1846	4,463	11,619	5	6	52	0¾	6,095 9 11	27	3¾	18,455 13 0	4	2	8½
1847	4,638	13,655	19	2	58	10¾	15,632 9 4	67	5	16,479 1 10	3	11	0¾
1848	4,343	11,750	8	11	54	1¼	27,709 3 10	127	7¼	520 7 0	0	2	4¾
1849	3,958	16,105	0	8	81	4½	16,410 16 2	82	11	214 11 5	0	1	1
1850	4,073	12,265	14	6	60	2¾	11,995 8 0	58	10¾	485 18 0	0	2	4¾
1851	4,585	11,325	1	7	49	4¾	9,813 0 6	42	9½	1,997 19 0	0	8	8½
1852	4,445	20,726	8	10	93	3	18,112 18 9	81	6	4,611 9 2	1	0	9
1853	4,984	14,711	12	9	59	0¼	8,007 6 7	32	1½	11,315 15 3	2	5	5
1854	5,335	14,409	4	0	54	0¼	10,361 19 2	38	10¼	15,363 0 1	2	17	7
1855	5,685	13,785	12	5	48	6	16,392 12 11	57	8	12,755 19 7	2	4	10½
1856	6,116	15,639	13	2	51	1¾	15,931 14 4	52	1	12,463 18 6	2	0	9
1857	6,421	16,049	17	11	50	0	17,199 0 8	53	6¾	11,314 15 9	1	15	3
1858	6,637	14,883	17	9	44	10½	24,578 11 3	74	0¾	1,620 2 3	0	4	10½
1859	7,317	19,923	12	3	54	5¾	13,988 10 8	38	2¾	7,555 3 7	1	0	7¾
1860	7,973	20,542	3	4	51	6¼	11,589 16 1	29	0¾	16,507 10 10	2	1	5
1861	8,229	20,899	0	7	50	9½	20,095 14 2	48	10	17,310 17 4	2	2	0¾
1862	8,458	20,085	0	11	47	6	29,337 10 1	69	4½	8,058 8 2	0	19	0¾
1863	8,840	23,722	0	3	53	8	23,872 11 0	54	0	7,907 17 5	0	17	10¾
1864	9,723	29,604	1	1	60	10¾	22,344 16 4	45	11½	15,167 2 2	1	11	2½
1865	10,604	32,166	13	1	60	8	20,525 7 8	38	8½	26,808 7 7	2	10	6¾
1866	11,121	31,579	12	10	56	9¼	30,459 15 2	54	9¼	27,928 5 4	2	10	2¾
1867	10,839	29,782	12	1	54	11½	52,539 11 1	96	11¼	5,171 6 5	0	9	6½
1868	9,853	40,907	14	7	83	0½	43,950 18 0	89	2½	2,128 3 0	0	4	3¾
1869	8,990	33,513	7	8	74	6¾	34,991 4 0	77	10	650 6 8	0	1	5¼
1870	8,994	31,621	10	7	70	3¾	26,056 4 2	57	11½	6,215 13 1	0	13	9¾
1871	10,019	31,421	6	7	62	8¾	19,172 1 0	38	3¼	18,464 18 8	1	16	10¾
1872	10,634	34,846	18	8	65	6½	15,446 12 2	29	0¾	37,864 9 9	3	11	2½
1873	11,512	33,885	17	4	58	10½	22,864 8 0	39	8¾	48,885 19 1	4	4	11¼
1874	11,925	34,800	3	10	58	4½	27,143 2 9	45	6¼	56,543 0 2	4	14	10
1875	12,336	35,136	11	1	56	11¼	28,008 9 0	45	5	63,671 2 3	5	3	2¾
1876	12,627	36,663	2	3	58	0¾	34,938 17 10	55	4	65,395 6 7	5	3	7
1877	12,612	36,554	11	1	57	11½	42,424 15 4	67	3¼	59,525 2 5	4	14	4¾
1878	12,620	36,348	2	8	57	7¼	56,979 4 11	90	1¾	38,894 0 2	3	1	7¾
1879	12,276	43,104	1	4	70	2¾	80,089 6 8	130	5¼	1,908 14 10	0	3	1¼
1880	11,580	47,094	19	6	81	4	41,301 2 8	71	4	7,702 11 7	0	13	3¾
1881	11,201	38,777	14	1	69	2¾	36,535 3 8	65	2¾	9,945 2 0	0	17	9
1882	11,448	39,223	13	7	68	6¼	28,037 18 3	48	11¾	21,130 17 4	1	16	11
1883	11,917	35,433	10	11	59	5½	30,533 18 6	51	3	26,030 9 10	2	3	8¼
1884	12,415	31,450	4	1	50	8	37,373 17 10	60	2¼	20,106 16 2	1	12	4¾
1885	12,376	39,099	4	6	63	2¼	45,880 17 8	74	1¾	13,325 3 0	1	1	6½
1886	12,037	44,877	6	3	74	6¾	52,218 1 4	86	9¼	5,984 7 11	0	9	11¼
1887	11,718	46,259	6	3	78	11¼	41,861 15 1	71	5¼	10,381 19 1	0	17	8½
1888	12,202	42,691	2	5	69	11¾	32,979 19 3	54	0¾	20,093 2 3	1	12	11¼
1889	13,805	39,800	9	6	57	8	26,005 3 11	37	8	33,888 7 10	2	9	3

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*f*) Table showing how the constitution of the Society has been supported, and at what rates the contributions have been levied on and paid by working Members each year from 1809 to 1889 inclusive.

	£	s.	d.
In 1809 the contribution per month was	0	1	3
„ 1810, August, „ „	0	2	3
„ 1812, February, „ „	0	1	3
„ 1813, August, „ „	0	1	9
„ 1818, „ „ „	0	2	0
„ 1827, „ „ „	0	3	0

From 1827 up to 1850, both years inclusive, the contribution to the General Fund, including levies, has ranged from three shillings per month up to one shilling per week, in addition to which there has been a large amount paid in the shape of auxiliary levies.

Year.	Contribution.	Reprts.	Accident Levies.	Auxiliary Levies.	Emigration, Benevolent, and Special Levies.	General Fund Levies.	Totals.
	£ s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1851	2 12 0	0 4	..	..	..	0 1 0	2 13 4
1852	2 13 0	0 4	..	1 0	..	3 2 9	5 17 1
1853	2 12 0	0 4	4 6	8 8	..	..	3 5 6
1854	2 12 0	0 4	1 0	0 4	..	..	2 13 8
1855	2 12 0	0 4	..	1 6	..	..	2 13 10
1856	2 12 0	0 4	1 0	1 6	..	..	2 14 10
1857	2 12 0	0 4	1 0	1 4	0 1½	..	2 14 9
1858	2 13 0	1 0	1 0	1 6	..	..	2 16 6
1859	2 12 0	1 0	..	..	0 1	0 6 6	2 19 7
1860	2 12 0	1 0	1 0	1 6	..	..	2 15 6
1861	2 12 0	1 0	1 6	0 6	..	..	2 15 0
1862	2 12 0	1 0	1 6	2 0	..	0 2 6	2 19 0
1863	2 12 0	1 0	1 6	1 6	..	0 8 8	3 4 8
1864	2 13 0	1 0	5 0	..	1 2	0 2 4	3 2 6
1865	2 12 0	1 0	..	..	4 6	0 4 0	3 1 6
1866	2 12 0	1 0	2 0	0 6	0 4	..	2 15 10
1867	2 12 0	1 0	3 0	0 6	..	..	2 16 6
1868	2 12 0	1 0	5 0	..	..	2 6 0	5 4 0
1869	2 12 0	1 0	..	..	..	2 12 0	5 5 0
1870	2 13 0	1 0	..	..	..	2 2 6	4 16 6
1871	2 12 0	0 6	2 6	..	..	1 2 8	3 17 8
1872	2 12 0	0 6	10 6	..	1 2	0 0 8	3 3 10
1873	2 12 0	0 6	..	3 6	1 5	..	2 17 5
1874	2 12 0	0 6	3 3	..	1 4	..	2 17 1
1875	2 12 0	0 6	..	2 0	0 4	..	2 14 10
1876	2 13 0	0 6	..	3 6	0 4	..	2 17 4
1877	2 12 0	0 6	3 6	0 6	0 4	..	2 16 10
1878	2 12 0	0 6	2 0	2 0	0 10	..	2 17 4
1879	2 12 0	0 6	6 0	6 0	0 4	0 19 8	4 4 6
1880	2 12 0	0 6	..	..	0 4	2 8 2	5 1 0
1881	2 13 0	0 6	..	..	0 4	1 6 6	4 0 4
1882	2 12 0	0 6	3 3	..	0 4	0 19 6	3 15 7
1883	2 12 0	0 8	0 9	9 0	..	..	3 2 5
1884	2 12 0	0 8	..	..	..	..	2 12 8
1885	2 12 0	0 8	..	..	..	1 0 6	3 13 2
1886	2 12 0	0 8	3 8	..	..	1 17 2	4 13 6
1887	2 13 0	0 8	..	..	..	2 9 0	5 2 8
1888	2 12 0	0 8	2 0	..	..	1 9 5	4 4 1
1889	2 12 0	0 8	..	..	..	0 13 0	3 5 8

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*g*) Table showing the Rates of Wages paid to

Branches.	Standard Weekly Wages beginning of the Year.	Advances made during the Year.		Standard Weekly Wages end of the Year.	Average Weekly Wages through the Year.
		Amount per Week.	Date of Advance.		
	£ s. d.	s. d.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Accrington	1 14 0 1 16 0	..	..	1 14 0 1 16 0	1 15 0
Barnsley	1 13 0	1 0	May 6	1 14 0	1 13 8
Barrow	1 11 6	1 3 1 3	January 14 October 14	1 14 0	1 13 0
Belfast	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Bilston	1 8 0	2 0	September 9	1 10 0	1 8 7
Birkenhead	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Birmingham ..	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Blackburn	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Bolton	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Bolton, Little ..	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Bradford	1 12 0	2 0	February 25	1 14 0	1 13 8
Brighton	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Bristol	1 10 0	2 0	July 29	1 12 0	1 10 10
Burnley	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Burton	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Bury, 1	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Bury, 2	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Butterley	1 8 0	..	..	1 8 0	1 8 0
Cardiff	1 12 0	1 0 1 0	February 11 April 29	1 14 0	1 13 7
Carlisle	1 7 0	2 0	February 3	1 9 0	1 8 10
Chatham	1 13 0	..	..	1 13 0	1 13 0
Chelsea	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
Chesterfield	1 9 0	1 6 1 6	March 11 October 14	1 12 0	1 10 9
Chester	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Cleckheaton ..	1 10 0	2 0	November 4	1 12 0	1 10 4
Cork	1 5 0	1 0 2 0	March 11 December 2	1 8 0	1 6 1
Crewe	1 12 0	..	..	1 12 0	1 12 0
Darlington	1 13 0	1 0 1 0	March 18 May 12	1 15 0	1 14 2
Dartford	1 16 0	2 0	August 29	1 18 0	1 16 10
Derby	1 12 0	..	..	1 12 0	1 12 0
Devonport	1 12 0	..	..	1 12 0	1 12 0
Dewsbury	1 10 0	2 0	April 29	1 12 0	1 11 4
Dublin	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Dudley	1 12 0	..	..	1 12 0	1 12 0
Dumfries	1 7 0	..	..	1 7 0	1 7 0
Exeter	1 4 0	..	..	1 4 0	1 4 0
Gainsboro'	1 8 0	..	..	1 8 0	1 8 0
Gateshead	1 14 0	2 0	June 15	1 16 0	1 14 11
Gloucester	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Grantham	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Greenwich	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
Halifax	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Hanley	1 12 0	..	..	1 12 0	1 12 0
Hartlepool	1 12 0	1 0	March 18	1 13 0	1 12 10
Haslingden	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Heywood	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Horwich	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Huddersfield ..	1 10 0	2 0	July 1	1 12 0	1 11 0
Hull	1 14 0	1 0	Novem. 11	1 15 0	1 14 2
Hyde	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Ipswich	1 8 0	..	..	1 8 0	1 8 0
Keighley	1 10 0	2 0	September 2	1 12 0	1 10 9
Lancaster	1 10 6	..	..	1 10 6	1 10 6
Leamington ..	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Leeds	1 10 0	2 0	May 13	1 12 0	1 11 1
Leeds, South ..	1 10 0	2 0	May 13	1 12 0	1 11 1

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

Members in each Branch through the year 1889.

Branches.	Standard Weekly Wages beginning of the Year.	Advances made during the Year.		Standard Weekly Wages end of the Year.	Average Weekly Wages through the Year.
		Amount per Week.	Date of Advance.		
	£ s. d.	s. d.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Leicester	1 12 0	2 0	February 18	1 14 0	1 13 9
Leigh	1 12 0	2 0 2 0	January 28 Sept. 30	1 16 0	1 14 4
Lincoln	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Liverpool	1 14 0	2 0	March 11	1 16 0	1 15 7
Liverpool, South ..	1 14 0	2 0	March 11	1 16 0	1 15 7
Llanelly	1 9 0	1 0	May 13	1 10 0	1 9 8
London	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
London, East ..	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
London, North ..	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
Macclesfield	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Maidstone	1 12 0	..	..	1 12 0	1 12 0
Manchester, 1 ..	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
Manchester, 2 ..	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
Mansfield	1 8 0	2 0	June 3	1 10 0	1 9 2
Middlesboro' ..	1 13 0	2 0	October 7	1 15 0	1 13 6
Mortomley	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Newcastle	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Newport	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Northampton ..	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Norwich	1 4 0	2 0	May 6	1 6 0	1 5 3
Nottingham	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Oldham, 1	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Oldham, 2	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Portsmouth	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Preston	1 14 0	2 0	May 13	1 16 0	1 15 3
Reading	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Renishaw	1 9 6	1 6	August 5	1 11 0	1 10 1
Retford	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Rochdale	1 12 0	2 0	June 17	1 14 0	1 13 1
Rotherham	1 14 0 1 16 0	..	..	1 14 0 1 16 0	1 15 0
Salford	1 18 0	..	..	1 18 0	1 18 0
Sheffield, 1	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Sheffield, 2	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Smethwick	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Southampton ..	1 10 0	2 0	October 7	1 12 0	1 10 6
South Shields ..	1 12 0	1 0	January 21	1 13 0	1 12 11
Sowerby Bridge ..	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Stalybridge	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
St. Helen's	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Stockport	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Stockton	1 10 0	2 0	July 2	1 12 0	1 11 0
Stourbridge	1 10 0	2 0	April 8	1 12 0	1 11 6
Sunderland	1 13 0	2 0	Nov. 18	1 15 0	1 13 3
Swansea	1 8 0	2 0	January 14	1 10 0	1 9 11
Swindon	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Todmorden	1 14 0	..	..	1 14 0	1 14 0
Toll End	1 12 0	2 0	January 1	1 14 0	1 14 0
Trench	1 4 0 1 8 0	2 0	April 8	1 6 0 1 10 0	1 7 5
Trowbridge	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Wakefield	1 10 0	2 0	June 17	1 12 0	1 11 1
Warrington	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Wednesbury ..	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Widnes	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Wigan	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Woolwich	1 16 0	..	..	1 16 0	1 16 0
Worcester	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0
Workington	1 10 0	2 0	September 9	1 12 0	1 10 7
York	1 10 0	..	..	1 10 0	1 10 0

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*h*) Example of Grants in

		£	s.	d.
1845	National Testimonial to Rowland Hill	5	0	0
1859	Sickle Forgers and Grinders, Sheffield	34	0	7
1860	Metal Trade	20	0	0
,,	Builders' Conference	140	0	0
,,	Lacemakers of Nottingham	30	0	0
,,	Glassmakers	15	0	0
,,	London Stonemasons' Strike and Lock-out	139	4	11
1854	Spademakers of Stourbridge	20	0	0
,,	Makers-up of Manchester	10	0	0
,,	Colliers of Bolton	10	0	0
,,	London Trades' Council	5	0	0
,,	Annual Subscription to Council	2	0	0
,,	South Yorkshire Miners	5	0	0
,,	Ironworkers' Association, Leeds	25	0	0
,,	Delegate to Trades' Conference	0	2	6
,,	Transferring Banking Account	1	2	0
,,	Tallow Chandlers, Dublin	5	0	0
,,	Blast Furnace Men, Dudley	10	0	0
,,	West End Boot Closers, London	2	0	0
,,	Lace Weavers of Nottingham	10	0	0
,,	Miners of South Staffordshire	10	0	0
1865	Wire Drawers of Halifax	5	0	0
,,	Bleachers of Barnsley	5	0	0
,,	West End Bootmakers, London	5	0	0
,,	Glass Cutters of Birmingham	10	0	0
,,	Bleachers of Nottingham	5	0	0
,,	Committee for the Amendment of Master and Workman's Act	100	0	0
,,	Chainmakers of Tipton, Staffordshire	10	0	0
,,	Brickmakers' Society, London	5	0	0
1866	Silk Weavers, Macclesfield	5	0	0
,,	Ironworkers' Society, Gateshead	50	0	0
,,	Ironworkers' Society, Derby	10	0	0
,,	Trades' Conference at Sheffield	5	0	0
,,	Reports, Parcel	0	1	8
,,	Spindle-makers, Stalybridge	5	0	0
,,	File Cutters, Sheffield	20	0	0
,,	West End Boot Closers, London	10	0	0
,,	Wireworkers, London	5	0	0
,,	Brickmakers, Hull	5	0	0
1867	Derbyshire Miners	10	0	0
,,	London Basket-makers	5	0	0
,,	London Tailors' Association	25	0	0
,,	London Trades' Conference at Exeter Hall to denounce the Sheffield outrages	11	8	8
,,	Printing Reports of the Conference Meetings and the progress made to get an Act of Parliament for the Protection of our Funds	6	11	8
,,	Deputations to the House of Parliament	4	2	2
1870	Ironmoulders of Paris	25	0	0
1871	Amalgamated Trades Congress	10	10	0
,,	Ironmoulders of Chicago	50	0	0
1872	Nut and Bolt Makers, Smethwick	20	0	0
	Carried forward ..	£926	4	2

		£	s.	d.
	Brought forward ..	926	4	2
1872	Agricultural Labourers, Leamington	20	0	0
,,	Nut and Bolt Makers, Lancashire	10	0	0
,,	Silk Throwers, Derby	10	0	0
,,	Matmakers, London	10	0	0
,,	Agricultural Labourers, Kent	20	0	0
,,	Mechanics, Halifax	10	0	0
,,	Cloggers, Bolton	5	0	0
,,	Agricultural Labourers, Aylesbury	20	0	0
,,	Rotary Operatives, Nottingham	5	0	0
,,	Frameworkers, Dumfries	10	0	0
,,	Trades Union Parliamentary Committee	26	18	6
1873	T. U. C. Parl. Committee	20	10	0
,,	Agricultural Labourers, Lincoln	20	0	0
,,	Gas Stokers' Defence Committee	25	0	0
,,	Farriers' Society, London	10	0	0
,,	Printers' Society, Edinburgh	25	0	0
,,	Levers, Lacemakers, Nottingham	25	0	0
,,	Belgian Ironworkers, Hainault	25	0	0
1874	Delegations and Contribution to Trades Congress	4	17	0
,,	Cutlers' Defence Fund	10	0	0
,,	Miners of Burnley	20	0	0
,,	Agricultural Labourers, Boston	25	0	0
,,	National Union of Agricultural Labourers	500	0	0
,,	Agricultural Labourers, Leamington	25	0	0
,,	Ropers and Twinemakers, London	10	0	0
,,	Factory Workers, Belfast	25	0	0
,,	Elastic Web Weavers, Leicester	10	0	0
,,	Damask Weavers, Belfast	10	0	0
,,	Trades Union Parliamentary Committee	20	0	0
,,	Seamen's Defence Fund, Plimsoll	478	0	0
1875	London Alliance Cabinetmakers	5	0	0
,,	Ironworkers, South Wales	55	0	0
,,	Coal Miners	45	0	0
,,	Shoemakers, East London	25	0	0
,,	Filesmiths' Union, Warrington	10	0	0
,,	Sheet-glass Makers, Sunderland	20	0	0
,,	Parliamentary Committee	20	0	0
1876	National Ironworkers, Darlington	50	0	0
,,	Silk Throwers, Nottingham	10	0	0
,,	Block Printers, Dartford	5	0	0
,,	Card Setters and Machine Tenters, Halifax	10	0	0
,,	Cabinet-makers, Dublin	10	0	0
,,	Iron-shipbuilders, Belfast	25	0	0
,,	Razor Grinders, Sheffield	10	0	0
,,	Parliamentary Committee	20	10	0
,,	Trades Federation Expenses	3	0	0
	Carried forward ..	£2,684	19	8

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

aid of kindred Societies.

		£	s.	d.
	Brought forward ..	2,684	19	8
1877	Parliamentary Committee ..	20	10	0
,,	West Lancashire Miners ..	20	0	0
,,	Nut and Bolt Makers, Staffordshire	10	0	0
,,	Cotton Spinners, Bolton ..	25	0	0
,,	Operative Masons, London..	25	0	0
,,	Getting up and publishing Replies to Leone Levi ..	15	0	0
,,	Nailmakers, Bromsgrove, Birmingham..	10	0	0
,,	Ironworkers, South Wales, Aberdare	20	0	0
1878	Parliamentary Committee ..	20	10	0
,,	Iron-shipbuilders on the Clyde	25	0	0
,,	Northumberland Miners ..	25	0	0
,,	Flint-glass Cutters, Glasgow	5	0	0
,,	Lancashire Weavers, Blackburn and Accrington ..	100	0	0
,,	Operative Dyers, Halifax ..	10	0	0
1879	Parliamentary Committee ..	20	10	0
,,	Central Strike Fund	50	0	0
1880	Parliamentary Committee and fee to Congress ..	21	0	0
1881	Parliamentary Committee and fee to Congress ..	25	10	0
,,	Trades Congress Reports ..	2	15	0
,,	Potters of Hanley	10	0	0
,,	Miners of Bolton	5	0	0
1882	Parliamentary Committee and fee to Congress ..	21	0	0
,,	Sickle Grinders, Sheffield ..	5	0	0
,,	Masons' Labourers, Bradford	5	0	0
,,	Framework Knitters, Loughborough	10	0	0
,,	Nailmakers, Birmingham ..	5	0	0
,,	Tobacco Pipe Makers, Glasgow and Manchester ..	10	0	0
,,	Paris Ironmoulders	25	0	0
,,	Lille Cotton Spinners ..	10	0	0
,,	North of England Glass Bottle Makers, Sunderland ..	10	0	0
,,	Dyers' Society, Derby ..	5	0	0
1883	Parliamentary Committee ..	20	10	0
,,	Bricklayers' Labourers' Society, Manchester	5	0	0
,,	File Hardeners' Society (Lock out) Sheffield	5	0	0
	Carried forward ..	£3,287	4	8

		£	s.	d.
	Brought forward ..	3,287	4	8
1883	Trawl Fishermen's Society, Hull	10	0	0
,,	Dyers' Society, Nottingham	5	0	0
,,	Weavers' Society, Bolton ..	5	0	0
,,	Nail and Chain Makers' Society, Staffordshire ..	5	0	0
,,	File Cutters' Society, Sheffield	10	0	0
,,	Philanthropic Coopers' Society, London	5	0	0
,,	North Staffordshire Miners' Union	15	0	0
,,	Weavers' Society, Congleton	10	0	0
1884	Weavers' Society, North-east Lancashire	25	0	0
,,	Boot and Shoe Makers' Society, London	20	0	0
,,	Elastic Weavers' Society, Leicester	5	0	0
,,	Miners of East Worcester and Staffordshire	15	0	0
,,	Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders' Society, Newcastle	15	0	0
,,	Parliamentary Committee ..	20	0	0
1885	Cocoa Mat and Fibre Makers' Society, London	10	0	0
,,	Cotton Operatives' Union, Oldham	15	0	0
,,	Parliamentary Committee ..	20	0	0
,,	Waggon-makers' Society, Manchester	5	0	0
1886	Parliamentary Committee ..	13	0	0
,,	Hosiery Society, Leicester ..	5	0	0
1887	Parliamentary Committee ..	12	10	0
1888	Do. do. ..	13	0	0
,,	International T. U. Congress	3	10	0
1889	Parliamentary Congress ..	10	10	0
,,	Seamen, Liverpool	10	10	0
,,	Dock Labourers, Deptford ..	20	0	0
,,	,, ,, East London	30	0	0
,,	Operative Lacemakers, Nottingham	10	0	0
,,	Warpers' Association, Nottingham	5	0	0
,,	Tobacco Pipe Makers, Manchester..	5	0	0
	Total	£3,640	4	8

(*i*) Example of Propositions issued and Votes recorded during the year 1889.

1st. That there be a Delegate Meeting in 1889:
For, 1,247. Against, 4,547. Majority against, 3,300.

2nd. Are you in favour of an Eight Hours Labour Day?
For, 3,608. Against, 1,350. Majority for, 2,258.

3rd. Are you in favour of it being obtained by Act of Parliament?
For, 1,843. Against, 1,410. Majority for, 433.

4th. That Core-makers be admitted Members of our Society:
For, 3,629. Against, 2,632. Majority for, 997.

5th. Are Alehouse Keepers and Shopkeepers entitled to Donation?
Yes, 4,953. No, 1,603. Majority yes, 3,350.

II.—RATES

FRIENDLY SOCIETY OF IRONFOUNDI

Table showing number of Members and of wage-earning Members, deducting Hono number of unemployed on each benefit; the number on dispute, and number unemployed n in each year and decade; also showing approximate weekly wages when at work, deduc holidays self-made, which taken from the approximate average wages when at work, leaves

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1
Years.	Mean Number of Members in the Society.	Deduct from preceding Column.			Mean Number of Wage-earning Members in the Country.	Yearly Average Number of Members in Decade.	Mean Number of Membe Unemployed.			
		Honorary Members.	Members Abroad.	Total.			On Benefits, as per several records.			On disputes and
							Super-annuation	Sick.	Donation	
1835	1,987	..	..	..	1,987		..	59	29	
1836	2,263	..	..	..	2,263		11	62	20	
1837	2,355	..	..	..	2,355		13	136	221	
1838	3,220	..	..	..	3,220		16	95	198	
1839	3,412	..	..	..	3,412		18	114	215	
1840	3,498	..	..	..	3,498	2,833·0	20	136	328	
1841	2,962	..	..	..	2,962		18	151	250	
1842	2,427	..	..	..	2,427		14	66	165	
1843	2,745	..	..	..	2,745		17	52	108	
1844	3,461	..	..	..	3,461		15	65	61	
1845	4,216	..	..	..	4,216		15	76	32	
1846	4,463	..	..	..	4,463		14	114	689	
1847	4,638	18	42	60	4,578		26	149	497	
1848	4,343	18	64	82	4,261		26	148	1,209	
1849	3,958	7	54	61	3,897		30	68	733	
1850	4,073	12	71	83	3,990	4,448·7	33	82	394	
1851	4,585	6	60	66	4,519		31	94	303	
1852	4,445	10	62	72	4,373		33	94	751	
1853	4,984	9	68	77	4,907		34	90	167	
1854	5,335	7	45	52	5,283		45	97	278	
1855	5,685	11	40	51	5,634		45	104	570	
1856	6,116	13	44	57	6,059		48	116	541	
1857	6,421	14	53	67	6,354		57	125	587	
1858	6,687	12	68	80	6,557		68	124	1,073	
1859	7,317	22	59	81	7,236		76	126	365	
1860	7,973	16	51	67	7,906	7,459·2	76	138	229	
1861	8,229	24	55	79	8,150		77	150	710	
1862	8,458	19	72	91	8,367		80	161	1,166	
1863	8,840	19	99	118	8,722		85	182	825	
1864	9,723	19	97	116	9,607		89	202	436	
1865	10,604	20	130	150	10,454		91	226	382	
1866	11,121	20	169	189	10,932		93	246	720	
1867	10,839	32	230	262	10,577		100	248	1,725	
1868	9,853	27	190	217	9,636		117	239	1,773	
1869	8,990	20	218	238	8,752		132	230	1,392	
1870	8,994	19	189	208	8,786	10,251·2	152	224	619	
1871	10,019	24	140	164	9,855		154	248	242	
1872	10,634	32	132	164	10,470		146	243	149	
1873	11,512	32	185	217	11,295		153	236	365	
1874	11,925	31	139	170	11,755		165	273	471	
1875	12,336	38	110	148	12,188		181	289	438	
1876	12,627	36	95	131	12,496		193	316	738	
1877	12,612	41	88	129	12,483		205	298	1,149	
1878	12,620	44	100	144	12,476		217	319	1,842	
1879	12,276	46	234	280	11,996		220	308	2,748	
1880	11,580	51	225	276	11,304	11,883·3	241	316	1,263	
1881	11,201	45	259	304	10,897		264	330	880	
1882	11,448	39	258	297	11,151		285	305	498	
1883	11,917	41	236	277	11,640		302	333	515	
1884	12,418	43	172	215	12,203		345	336	902	
1885	12,376	42	172	214	12,142		379	351	1,351	
1886	12,037	52	249	301	11,736		433	346	1,672	
1887	11,718	46	281	327	11,391		462	330	1,174	
1888	12,202	46	280	326	11,876		485	350	663	
1889	13,805	47	144	191	13,614		478	334	250	

VAGES TABLE.

F ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND WALES.

embers and Members abroad; the annual average number for each decade, and average enefit; the average unemployed in each year and decade; percentage of unemployed Members nemployed time, and loss of time for holidays—general and local (under obligation), and for et average wages-income of Members as shown in column 21, and hours of labour in last column

12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Mean Number of Unemployed Members.		Proportion of Unemployed Members to every 100 Members in the Society.		Approximate Weekly Wages when at work.	Deductions from Column 16 in respect of				Net Average Wages per Week of Members.	Hours of Labour per Week.
					Unemployed Time, as shown in Column 15.	Holidays.		Total Deductions.		
						General, and local under obligation.	On Members' own account.			
In each Year.	In each Decade.	In each Year.	In each Decade.							
108		5·4		£ s. d.					£ s. d.	
115		5·0								
294		12·4								
341		10 5								
381		11·1								
518	439·6	14·8	9·1	1 6 3	9·1	2·0	1·0	12·1	1 3 9	63 to 61½
549		18·5								
269		11·0								
204		7·4								
176		5·1								
165		3·9								
862		19·3								
718		15·7								
426		33·4								
871		22·3								
550	680·2	13·8	15·5	1 7 6	15·5	2·0	1 0	18 5	1 3 1	63 to 59½
474		10·5								
922		21·1								
341		6·9								
473		8·6								
775		12·7								
765		12·6								
832		13·0								
330		20·2								
639		8·8								
522	941·3	6·6	12·6	1 9 0	12·6	2 0	1·0	15·6	1 4 6	60 to 57½
018		12·4								
490		17·8								
179		13·5								
823		8·5								
803		7·6								
168		10·6								
178		20·5								
225		23·0								
841		21·0								
082	1,257·3	12·3	12·2	1 11 6	12·2	3 0	1·5	16·7	1 6 3	60 to 56½
742		7·5								58½ to 54
642		6·1								54
866		7·6								
026		8·7								
029		8·4								
372		10·9								
776		14·2								
502		20·0								
395		28·3								
933	1,775·8	17·1	14·8	1 13 0	14·8	4·0	1·0	19 8	1 6 6	
582		14·5								
199		10·7								
266		10·8								
705		13·9								
202		18·1		1 11 6	18·1	4·2	1·0	23·3	1 4 0	
595		22·1		1 10 9	22 1	4·5	1·0	27·6	1 2 3	
083		18·3		1 10 10	18·3	4·0	1·0	23·3	1 4 0	
603		13·5		1 12 10	13·5	3·5	1·0	18 0	1 7 0	
132		·2		1 14 5	8·2	2·0	1·0	11·2	1 11 2	

IRONFOUNDERS—*continued.*

(*j*) Table showing the numerical position of the Society in the various classes of Membership; also number of Entrances, Exclusions, and Deaths, male and female, from 1840 to 1890.

Year.	First-class Members.	Second-class Members.	Third-class Members.	Honorary Members.	Members Abroad.	Superannuated Members.	Paying acknowledgment.	Travellers relieved on last Saturday in each Year.	Total No. of Members end of each Year.	No. of Members entered in each Year.	No. of Members excluded in each Year.	Deaths.	
												Males.	Females.
1840	3,478	..	..	..	..	20	..	..	3,498	283	173	24	16
1841	2,944	..	..	..	..	18	..	..	2,962	6	507	35	22
1842	2,413	..	..	..	..	14	..	..	2,427	..	459	30	43
1843	2,728	..	..	..	..	17	..	..	2,745	419	75	26	22
1844	3,446	..	..	..	..	15	..	..	3,461	914	176	22	15
1845	4,201	..	..	..	..	15	..	..	4,216	959	181	23	23
1846	4,449	..	..	..	..	14	..	..	4,463	424	147	30	26
1847	3,920	50	..	18	42	26	47	535	4,638	433	208	50	21
1848	4,152	52	..	18	64	26	31	..	4,343	123	378	40	36
1849	3,586	51	..	7	54	30	32	..	3,958	193	530	48	31
1850	3,879	50	..	12	71	33	28	..	4,073	422	246	61	55
1851	4,329	64	..	6	60	26	36	64	4,585	704	145	47	33
1852	4,264	50	..	10	62	32	27	..	4,445	199	344	42	35
1853	4,759	64	..	9	68	33	31	20	4,984	878	195	63	28
1854	4,689	65	91	7	45	56	31	45	5,335	685	311	32	25
1855	5,228	85	156	6	41	58	34	77	5,685	538	256	44	41
1856	5,575	89	188	13	44	62	30	115	6,116	818	207	51	37
1857	5,672	160	206	17	71	80	43	172	6,421	678	304	39	28
1858	6,022	115	213	12	68	88	36	83	6,637	471	255	61	48
1859	6,815	100	138	22	59	94	56	33	7,317	762	317	73	35
1860	7,542	90	83	16	51	95	46	50	7,973	1,160	259	62	49
1861	7,744	97	59	24	55	98	40	112	8,229	773	316	62	55
1862	7,973	86	52	19	72	105	59	92	8,458	594	344	61	66
1863	8,386	73	43	19	199	110	74	37	8,840	745	381	79	64
1864	9,160	70	85	18	117	117	110	46	9,723	1,306	376	111	87
1865	10,034	72	102	15	131	114	95	41	10,604	792	172	55	28
1866	10,404	67	129	20	169	115	115	102	11,121	1,534	552	178	126
1867	10,100	59	131	32	230	134	60	93	10,839	540	491	92	75
1868	9,126	50	154	27	190	161	62	83	9,853	322	993	109	75
1869	8,209	46	179	20	218	162	59	97	8,990	297	871	97	92
1870	8,241	37	226	19	189	163	86	33	8,994	804	623	124	62
1871	9,308	38	206	24	140	184	114	5	10,019	1,523	373	111	66
1872	10,487	38	200	32	132	183	157	21	10,634	1,734	377	115	65
1873	10,882	33	237	32	185	193	168	45	11,512	1,146	413	148	81
1874	11,170	28	259	31	139	224	198	51	11,925	954	438	132	108
1875	11,669	30	290	38	110	234	177	44	12,336	965	304	150	117
1876	11,717	27	328	36	95	253	147	60	12,627	822	425	141	114
1877	11,618	23	334	41	88	269	111	118	12,612	755	399	155	103
1878	11,656	20	362	44	100	271	86	100	12,620	606	374	163	92
1879	10,721	16	414	46	234	287	70	126	12,276	337	826	174	109
1880	10,082	13	410	51	225	317	79	70	11,580	396	862	119	91
1881	9,973	12	408	45	259	344	122	56	11,201	662	454	173	103
1882	10,254	12	377	39	258	372	93	43	11,448	834	412	138	88
1883	10,707	12	365	41	236	371	128	57	11,917	943	331	153	116
1884	11,232	12	422	42	173	361	110	63	12,415	992	306	149	97
1885	11,027	12	477	42	172	436	139	71	12,376	716	452	177	135
1886	10,585	10	492	52	249	493	85	71	12 037	454	686	160	110
1887	10,221	5	499	46	281	518	84	64	11,718	559	612	176	115
1888	10,752	2	523	38	213	537	121	16	12,202	1,077	430	180	98
1889	12,282	3	647	47	144	535	140	7	13,805	2,110	341	175	100

AMALGAMATED CARPENTERS AND JOINERS.

(*a*) Table showing the progress made by the Society since its formation.

Dates.	Branches.	Members.	Cash Balance in hand.	Net Increase of Branches, Members, and Funds.			
				Dates.	Branches.	Members.	Cash Balance in hand.
			£ s. d.				£ s. d.
1860	20	618	321 3 2	1860	20	618	321 3 2
1861	32	650	593 12 0	1861	12	32	272 8 10
1862	38	949	849 8 10	1862	6	299	255 16 9
1863	53	1,718	2,042 11 3	1863	15	769	1,193 2 5
1864	81	3,279	4,566 10 0	1864	28	1,561	2,523 18 9
1865	134	5,670	8,320 13 7	1865	53	2,391	3,754 3 6
1866	187	8,002	13,052 4 3	1866	53	2,332	4,731 10 3
1867	203	8,022	15,153 11 2	1867	16	20	2,101 6 11
1868	218	8,736	17,179 16 1	1868	15	714	2,026 4 10
1869	214	9,305	17,626 14 6	1869	6	569	446 18 5
1870	236	10,178	17,568 19 4	1870	12	873	.. ..
1871	242	9,764	16,829 7 1	1871	6	..	.. ..
1872	226	11,236	19,849 8 6	1872	..	1,472	3,020 0 5
1873	249	12,789	30,450 11 3	1873	23	1,553	10,601 2 9
1874	265	13,817	42,264 4 6	1874	16	1,028	10,813 13 2
1875	286	14,917	55,300 0 8	1875	21	1,100	14,035 16 1
1876	317	16,038	70,109 13 10	1876	31	1,121	14,809 13 2
1877	330	16,829	74,248 7 8	1877	13	791	4,138 13 10
1878	337	16,574	71,370 7 4	1878	7	..	.. ..
1879	342	17,034	48,779 3 5	1879	5	460	.. ..
1880	354	17,764	41,386 9 3	1880	12	730	.. ..
1881	363	18,765	40,960 16 6	1881	9	1,001	.. ..
1882	376	20,622	46,389 10 0	1882	13	1,857	5,428 13 5
1883	397	22,839	55,869 8 5	1883	21	2,217	9,479 18 5
1884	427	24,784	57,253 2 8	1884	30	1,945	1,383 14 2
1885	440	25,781	44,711 4 0	1885	13	997	.. ..
1886	448	24,979	40,387 4 1	1886	8	..	.. ..
1887	452	25,497	33,667 17 7	1887	4	518	.. ..
1888	460	25,050	37,896 1 11	1888	8	..	4,228 4 3
1889	471	26,472	53,140 9 7	1889	11	1,422	15,244 7 8

AMALGAMATED CARPENTERS AND JOINERS—*continued.*

(*b*) Amounts paid each year for the various Benefits since the formation

Year.	Number of Members.	Unemployed.		Tool.		Sick.		Funeral.		Accident.	
		Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.
		£	£ s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1860	618	25	0 0 9¾	10	0 4	11	0 4½	17	0 6½	..	..
1861	650	247	0 7 7	40	1 2¾	92	2 10	23	0 8½	..	..
1862	949	267	0 5 8½	39	0 9¾	249	5 3	73	1 6½	..	..
1863	1,718	435	0 5 0¾	101	1 2	571	6 7¾	95	1 1¼	30	0 4¼
1864	3,279	211	0 1 3½	88	0 6½	1,031	6 3½	212	1 3½	..	..
1865	5,670	347	0 1 2¾	114	0 4¾	1,370	4 10¾	257	0 10¾	200	0 8½
1866	8,002	1,335	0 3 4	362	0 11	2,246	5 7¼	423	1 0¾	360	0 10¾
1867	8,022	5,271	0 13 1¾	524	1 3¾	3,271	8 2	581	1 5½	200	0 6
1868	8,736	5,874	0 13 5½	619	1 5	4,204	9 7½	830	1 10¾	800	1 10
1869	9,305	8,904	0 19 1½	423	0 11	5,008	10 9¼	829	1 9½	500	1 1
1870	10,178	10,052	0 19 9	659	1 3½	5,513	10 10	1,038	2 1½	300	0 7
1871	9,764	6,436	0 13 2¼	360	0 8¾	5,595	11 5½	1,105	2 3	400	0 9¾
1872	11,236	3,458	0 6 2	381	0 8¼	5,566	9 11	1,103	1 11½	700	1 3
1873	12,789	3,085	0 4 10	566	0 10¾	5,865	9 2	1,248	1 11½	300	0 5¾
1874	13,817	2,757	0 4 0	785	1 1½	6,665	9 7¾	1,312	1 10¾	1,000	1 5¼
1875	14,917	2,658	0 3 6¾	705	0 11¼	7,651	10 3	1,454	1 11½	1,150	1 6½
1876	16,038	2,963	0 3 8½	1,148	1 5¼	7,894	9 10¼	1,506	1 10½	950	1 2¼
1877	16,829	4,205	0 5 0	903	1 0¾	8,409	10 0	1,702	2 0¼	1,560	1 10½
1878	16,574	10,504	0 12 8	1,134	1 4½	8,816	10 7¾	1,946	2 4¼	1,200	1 5¼
1879	17,034	27,902	1 12 9	997	1 2	11,008	12 11	2,003	2 4¼	1,500	1 10
1880	17,764	21,922	1 4 8	1,412	1 7	11,731	13 2½	1,924	2 2	1,200	1 4¼
1881	18,765	19,182	1 0 5¼	1,035	1 1	12,575	13 4	2,174	2 3¾	1,050	1 1¼
1882	20,622	14,735	0 14 3¼	1,290	1 3	12,278	11 10¾	2,238	2 2	1,650	1 7
1883	22,839	16,073	0 14 0¾	1,139	0 11¾	13,061	11 5¼	2,357	2 0¾	1,150	1 0
1884	24,784	23,262	0 18 9¼	1,641	1 3¾	14,852	11 11¾	2,499	2 0¼	1,450	1 2
1885	25,781	34,909	1 7 0¾	1,499	1 1¾	16,719	12 11½	2,913	2 3	1,750	1 4¼
1886	24,979	40,752	1 12 7½	1,563	1 3	17,469	13 11¾	2,804	2 3	1,700	1 4¼
1887	25,497	32,814	1 5 8¾	1,510	1 2¼	17,228	13 6	2,951	2 3¾	1,370	1 0¾
1888	25,050	30,105	1 4 0¼	1,600	1 3¼	16,895	13 5¾	3,211	2 6¾	1,150	0 11
1889	26,472	18,805	0 14 2¼	1,466	1 1¼	15,822	11 11¼	2,901	2 2¼	1,320	0 11¾

AMALGAMATED CARPENTERS AND JOINERS—*continued.*

of the Society, in June, 1860, and the Balance at the end of each year.

Year.	Superannuation.		Trade Privileges.		Benevolent Grants.		Grants & Loans to other trades.		Value of Assets at the end of each Year.
	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	Yearly Amount.	Per Member.	
	£	s. d.	£	£ s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£
1860	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	321
1861	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	593
1862	..	..	7	0 0 1¾	..	..	..	..	849
1863	..	..	10	0 0 1½	..	..	..	..	2,042
1864	..	..	762	0 4 7¾	..	..	..	..	4,566
1865	..	..	1,941	0 6 10½	121	0 5¼	69	0 3	8,320
1866	..	..	2,525	0 6 3¾	271	0 8¼	109	0 3¼	13,052
1867	16	0 0½	1,818	0 4 6¼	308	0 9½	103	0 3	15,153
1868	34	0 0¾	455	0 1 0½	351	0 9¾	93	0 2½	17,179
1869	60	0 1½	588	0 1 3¼	436	0 11¼	77	0 2	17,626
1870	151	0 3½	651	0 1 3½	432	0 10¼	29	0 0¾	17,568
1871	131	0 3¼	1,120	0 2 3½	425	0 10½	5	0 0½	16,829
1872	128	0 2¾	4,595	0 8 2	444	0 9½	80	0 1¾	22,068
1873	97	0 1¾	2,964	0 4 7½	466	0 8¾	155	0 3	32,732
1874	202	0 3½	1,769	0 2 6¾	540	0 9½	650	0 11¼	45,551
1875	205	0 3¼	1,581	0 2 1½	690	0 11	95	0 1½	59,736
1876	217	0 3¼	2,831	0 3 6½	625	0 9½	32	0 0½	74,762
1877	280	0 4	13,168	0 15 7¾	637	0 9	130	0 1¾	79,006
1878	385	0 5½	12,292	0 14 10	793	0 11½	126	0 1¾	76,166
1879	445	0 6¼	10,558	0 12 4¾	758	0 10¾	49	0 0¾	53,596
1880	487	0 6½	2,522	0 2 10	698	0 9¾	39	0 0½	46,395
1881	665	0 8½	732	0 0 9¼	756	0 9½	56	0 0½	46,111
1882	1,030	0 11¾	2,259	0 2 2¼	769	0 8¾	35	0 0¼	52,112
1883	1,480	1 3¼	1,251	0 1 1	765	0 8	97	0 1	61,617
1884	2,003	1 7½	2,140	0 1 8¾	960	0 9¼	154	0 1½	63,270
1885	2,581	2 0	4,625	0 3 7	1,051	0 9¾	88	0 0¾	50,850
1886	3,090	2 5¾	1,945	0 1 6½	862	0 8¼	74	0 0¾	46,725
1887	3,797	2 11¾	4,487	0 3 6¼	713	0 6¾	73	0 0½	39,927
1888	4,519	3 7¼	4,499	0 3 7	791	0 7½	31	0 0¼	44,235
1889	5,026	3 9½	2,299	0 2 3	761	0 6¾	133	0 1	58,922

TOTAL AMOUNT OF BENEFIT PAID DURING THE ABOVE YEARS:

Unemployed Benefit	..	..	£349,495 being	£25 0 10 per Member for 30 years.
Tool	,,	..	24,113 ,,	1 14 6½ ,, ,,
Sick	,,	..	239,665 ,,	17 3 5¼ ,, ,,
Funeral	,,	..	43,729 ,,	3 2 8 ,, ,,
Accident	,,	..	25,040 ,,	1 15 10½ ,, ,,
Superannuation	,,	..	27,029 ,,	1 18 8¾ ,, ,,
Trade Privileges	..	..	87,094 ,,	6 4 9½ ,, ,,
Benevolent Grants	..	..	15,423 ,,	1 2 1 ,, ,,
Grants and Loans to other Trades			2,582 ,,	0 3 8¼ ,, ,,
Total	..	..	£814,170	£58 6 7¾

III.—EXAMPLE OF STRIKE SCHEDULE.

FORM OF APPLICATION TO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, IN THE EVENT OF A PROPOSAL TO STRIKE.

The following Form is issued by the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners whenever an application is made for an amended Schedule of Trade Privileges. (Similar information has to be given by other Societies, although not always in such a precise and detailed manner):

An application having been made to the Executive Council by the Members of the Society in for the support of the Society in endeavouring to improve their social position, you are required to fill up this Schedule, and return it to the General Office; and if there be any special circumstances connected with the case, the same must be stated on the fourth page (under the head of General Statement).

By order,

F. CHANDLER, *General Secretary.*

General Office:
95, *Brunswick Street,*
Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester.

---

1. Date of meeting at which application was made.
2. Does the application emanate from a meeting of the whole of the members in the district?
3. How many members have we in the district?
4. How many were present at the meeting when the application was made?
5. State the number of hours worked per week at the present, and the present rate of weekly wages.
6. State the number of working hours per week and the rate of weekly wages under the proposed new arrangement.
7. If any other privileges are asked for, state them.
8. Is a recognised working code of rules already in operation? If so, forward a copy.
9. When do you propose to give notice to your employers?
10. When does the said notice terminate?

11. What number of votes were recorded in favour of the proposed alterations at the meeting from which this request emanated ?

12. Were any amendments proposed ? If so, state the character of the amendments, and the number of votes recorded for each.

13. Are there any other societies in the district ? If so, state their names and number of members.

14. Have the members of other societies applied for or obtained the support of their respective societies ?

15. What number of non-society men have you in the district ?

16. Were the proposed alterations adopted at a general meeting of the Trade ? If so, state the number of Carpenters and Joiners present, and the number of votes recorded in favour of the alterations.

17. What provision is made for the support of non-society men in the event of a dispute ?

18. When did you gain your last advance of wages and reduction of hours ?

19. State the advantages gained at that time.

20. Did a strike or lock-out occur at that time ? If so, how long did it last ?

21. What is the state of trade at present, and what reasons have you for anticipating that at the time when the notice expires the state of trade will be such as to induce your employers to concede the advance asked for ?

GENERAL STATEMENT.

(*Here insert any special circumstances connected with the case.*)

Form of Resolution to be adopted by the Senior Branch of the District.

Name of Branch No. of do.

Meeting night 1890.

Proposed by Brother seconded by Brother and resolved, "That having heard the statement read as recorded in this Schedule, it is hereby adopted as a correct statement of the present position of District, and our Branch Secretary is hereby instructed to forward it to the General Office for the consideration of the Executive Council."

Signed { *President.* *Secretary.*

IV.—THE EIGHT HOURS MOVEMENT.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE AMALGAMATED ENGINEERS.

This subject was again brought before the Trades Union Congress, at Dundee, the results of the discussion and voting thereon being very unsatisfactory. Whilst all are agreed that eight hours ought to be the standard day's work, the great question is, How it is to be obtained—by voluntary effort or by Act of Parliament? The latter will take as long to bring about, if not longer, than the former. It will no doubt be said that we have the power in our own hands at the ballot-box. This is true, and it is also true we have the power at the present time in our own hands, without waiting for a General Election, viz., by the trades of the country uniting together, and saying, through their governing bodies, "that eight hours shall be the standard day's work," instead of the nine hours, or any other given number at present practised by many trades; and by this process no factory inspectors would be needed, no extra costs would be entailed, and every society would maintain its present form of government, with a few alterations of minor details.

That such is the best way to obtain a reduction of the hours of labour I have long been convinced, and there are others who hold the same opinions, or who are too apathetic to move in the matter. If we are to take any notice of the return of votes as presented to the Dundee Trades Union Congress in 1889, Mr. Broadhurst stated to that meeting that 1,200 circulars on the eight hours question had been sent out to the various trades societies in the United Kingdom, and the representatives at that meeting numbered over 885,000, and in reply to these circulars only thirty-seven societies responded, and we here give the returns as presented to the meeting and officially reported as having been received up to August 6th, 1889.

THE VOTING ON THE EIGHT HOURS QUESTION.

Name of Association.	Number of Members.	Are you in favour of Eight Hours?		Are you in favour of its being obtained by Act of Parliament.	
		For.	*Against.*	*For.*	*Against.*
Alliance Cabinet-makers' Association	1,700	436	31	391	75
Bakers of Scotland, Operative ..	3,214	1,271	..	1,181	90
Barge Builders	172	60	..	60	..
Bookbinders and Machine Rulers' Consolidated Union	1,909	620	167	467	139
Bookbinding, Society of Women employed in	230	..	100	..	..
Boot and Shoe Makers, Amalgamated Society of	4,000	169	27	60	103
Boot and Shoe Rivetters and Finishers, National Union of ..	20,117	629	162	584	24
Cabinet-makers, Amalgamated Union of (Westminster Branch)	38	15	..	6	8
Carpenters and Joiners, Associated	3,966	680	60	427	119
Compositors, London Society of ..	7,400	2,201	1,411	1,578	561
Coopers, Mutual Association of ..	3,744	3,744	..	..	3,744
Cotton Spinners, Amalgamated Association of Operative ..	17,125	..	17,125	..	..
Cotton Spinners, Amalgamated Association of Operative, Oldham	5,660	..	5,660	..	..
Cigar-makers' Mutual Association	850	324	155	229	101
Hosiery Union, Amalgamated ..	800	697	5	697	7
Ironfounders, Friendly Society of	5,664	3,608	1,350	1,843	1,410
Ironmoulders of Scotland, Associated	5,500	358	928	..	1,286
Miners' Union, Ayrshire	1,000	10,000	..	10,000	..
Miners' Association, Cumberland	3,000	3,000	..	3,000	..
Miners' Association, Derbyshire ..	4,000	2,253	15	1,851	60
Plasterers, Edinburgh District of Operative	250	250	..	..	250
Plasterers, Metropolitan Society of Operative	95	41	..	41	..
Railway Servants, Amalgamated Society of	13,000	3,344	350	2,190	1,504
Razor Grinders' Protection Society, Sheffield	150	150	..	150	..
Rotary-power Framework Knitters, Nottingham	390	366	20	339	1
Scissors Grinders, Society of ..	200	200	..	200	..
Shipwrights' Society, Associated	5,000	854	134	339	564
Steam-engine Makers' Society ..	5,350	1,429	97	629	650
Stonemasons, Operative Society of	11,000	578	17	388	165
Typographical Association (H.R.S.)	7,590	1,505	1,191	1,269	1,141
Typographical Society, Edinburgh	740	371	42	239	110
Northern Counties Amalgamated Weavers' Association	33,756	..	33,756	..	..
Zincworkers, London Operative ..	70	..	70	..	..
Associated Blacksmiths' Society, Scottish	1,900	476	10	331	162
Liverpool United Trades' Council	10,000	20	7	22	2
Wolverhampton Trades' Council ..	..	7	4,500	..	7
Accrington and District Trades' Council	4,500	..	..	..	..
Thirty-seven Societies ..	178,376	39,656	67,390	28,511	12,283

V.—OVERTIME.

Overtime in Government Factories—Woolwich and Enfield.

	Years.	Royal Laboratory.	Carriage Department	Gun Factory.	Small Arms Factory.	Totals.
Average Weekly Number of Men employed.	1884–6	4,815	1,738	1,435	1,780	9,768
	1886–7	4,548	2,041	1,989	2,136	10,704
	1887–8	4,809	2,027	2,097	2,169	11,102
	1888–9	5,033	2,211	2,202	1,983	11,429
	1889–90	5,020	2,832	2,589	2,711	12,702
	Averages	4,825	2,170	2,062	2,156	11,141
Average Weekly No. of Men working Overtime.	1884–6	2,444	1,204	609	685	1,647
	1886–7	220	173	795	748	4,216
	1887–8	Nil.	19	108	202	329
	1888–9	293	41	438	357	829
	1889–90	410	165	294	788	1,657
	Averages	673	320	389	566	1,738
Total Number of Hours Systematic Overtime worked.	1884–6	2,765,607	1,589,206	1,028,169	599,675	5,982,657
	1886–7	156,597	116,160	188,654	119,391	580,802
	1887–8	Nil.	5,889	31,867	92,867	130,623
	1888–9	Nil.	14,951	40,833	190,987	246,771
	1889–90	Nil.	84,640	90,867	372,605	548,012
	Totals ..	2,922,204	1,810,846	1,280,390	1,375,425	7,488,865
Average Weekly No. of Hours worked per man of the total employed.	1884–6	4·9	9·3	7·2	2·7	7·7
	1886–7	0·7	1·1	1·8	1·1	4·7
	1887–8	Nil.	·0558	·292	·82	1¼
	1888–9	2·166	·1300	·3564	1·85	1¼
	1889–90	·333	·6833	·6747	2·64	4¼
Average Weekly No. of Hours Overtime per man working Overtime.	1884–6	7·1	13·2	17·4	5·2	14·3
	1886–7	13·7	12·9	4·6	3·1	1·6
	1887–8	Nil.	5·9605	5·676	8·84	20·0
	1888–9	3·7206	7·0126	5·688	10·32	26½
	1889–90	4·6772	9·8648	5·942	9·09	29½

NOTES.—The two years 1884–86 comprise two whole years, 1884 and 1885, and January and February, 1886, or 26 months.

The other years are from the beginning of March to the end of February respectively, or one whole year each.

The averages of overtime per year are not computed, as the period during which it was worked varied greatly. For example, overtime was only worked 37 weeks in 1885 in the Enfield Factory, and only for one month out of the two months in 1886.

The full effect of the system is seen by comparing the average number of men working overtime with the total number of hours so worked. For example, an average of 1,738 men worked 4,315 hours each during the period.

VI.—TRADES UNION CONGRESSES.—Dates, Places, Representation, etc.

(*a*) Tabular Statement of the Twenty-two Trades Union Congresses held 1868 to 1889 inclusive.

Year.	Date.	Towns where Congress held.	Number of Delegates present.	Number of Societies Represented.	Number of Members Represented.	Income from Delegates' Fees.	Congress Expenditure.	Cash Balances.
1868	June 2 to 6	Manchester ..	34	No record.	118,367	Proportional payment of expenses only by Delegates present.		Nil.
1869	August 23 ,, 28	Birmingham	48	40	250,000			Nil.
1871	March 6 ,, 11	London ..	50	40	289,403	£24 10 0	£9 14 0	£14 16 0
1872	January 8 ,, 13	Nottingham	77	63	375,000	38 10 0	31 1 7	8 8 5
1873	,, 13 ,, 13	Leeds	132	140	730,074	66 0 0	46 16 6	19 3 6
1874	,, 12 ,, 18	Sheffield ..	169	153	1,191,922	84 10 0	36 13 3	47 16 9
1875	,, 18 ,, 23	Liverpool ..	151	107	818,032	75 0 0	66 13 4	8 16 8
1875	October 11 ,, 16	Glasgow ..	139	109	539,823	69 10 0	67 5 8	4 3 5
1876	Sept. 18 ,, 23	Newcastle ..	140	113	556,488	70 0 0	76 17 8	Deficit.
1877	,, 17 ,, 22	Leicester ..	141	112	691,089	70 10 0	52 16 0	17 14 0
1878	,, 9 ,, 14	Bristol ..	136	114	623,957	68 10 0	57 16 6	10 13 6
1879	,, 15 ,, 20	Edinburgh ..	115	92	541,892	58 0 0	40 11 3	17 8 9
1880	,, 13 ,, 18	Dublin ..	120	105	494,222	61 0 0	48 15 2	12 4 10
1881	,, 12 ,, 17	London ..	157	122	463,899	78 0 0	63 0 5	14 19 7
1882	,, 18 ,, 23	Manchester ..	153	126	509,337	78 10 0	57 1 3	21 8 9
1883	,, 10 ,, 15	Nottingham ..	163	163	471,651	83 10 0	60 4 0	23 6 0
1884	,, 8 ,, 13	Aberdeen ..	142	129	598,033	71 0 0	43 16 6	27 4 6
1885	,, 7 ,, 12	Southport ..	141	136	580,976	80 10 0	47 2 7	33 7 5
1886	,, 6 ,, 11	Hull	143	121	633,088	72 10 0	42 18 8	29 11 4
1887	,, 5 ,, 10	Swansea ..	156	131	674,034	78 10 0	50 13 5	25 16 7
1888	,, 3 ,, 8	Bradford ..	165	138	816,944	82 10 0	69 5 0	13 5 0
1889	,, 2 ,, 7	Dundee ..	210	171	885,055	105 10 0	68 16 8½	36 13 3½
Total, Nineteen Towns in all.			..	..	..	£1,417 10 0	£1,037 19 5½	Included in the final balance.

Notes.—(*a*) No authentic record exists as to the numbers represented at Manchester in 1868. The figures above given are from the newspaper reports. See *Manchester Guardian*, June 3 to 6, 1868.
(*b*) No regular or fixed fee was exacted at the two first Congresses—each delegate paid a proportionate share.
(*c*) No Congress was held in 1870 as at first intended—it was postponed until 1871.
(*d*) Two Congresses were held in 1875—one at Liverpool in January, the other at Glasgow in October.
(*e*) The Congress sits the whole week, daily from 10 to 5; Mondays and Saturdays, half a day.
(*f*) One evening in the week is devoted to an aggregate meeting of the trades of the town.
(*g*) The Congress fee is 10*s.* per delegate; the balance, after payment of expenses, is carried to the funds.
(*h*) At the London Congress in 1881, six persons were expelled, not being *bonâ fide* delegates.
(*i*) The credentials are examined and reported upon by the Standing Orders Committee—the society sending delegates must pay the fee and the expense of the representative.
(*j*) Authorised Reports have been published since 1872.

TRADES UNION CONGRESSES.—

(*b*) Tabular Statement of Income and Expenditure of the close of the Dundee

Year.	Income.	Expenditure, under its several heads, as				
	Total Net Income.	Salary of Secretary yearly.	Voted to Treasurer yearly.	Committee Meetings and Delegations.	Parliamentary Papers, Bills, Acts, etc.	Stationery, Advertising, and Sundries.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1868 to 1870	(No permanent charges up to the year 1871—dating to London Congress.)					
1871	2 0 0	Nil.	Nil.	1 1 0	7 10 0	Next col.
1872	287 8 1	113 17 0	Nil.	24 9 3	0 10 0	6 18 5
1873	438 0 2	117 0 0	Nil.	64 0 6	12 5 11	24 16 3
1874	378 0 5	132 10 0	10 0 0	120 8 4	23 8 2	19 3 0
1875	420 0 8	97 10 0	15 0 0	205 4 0	19 15 2	20 9 8
1876	546 19 11	100 16 0	15 0 0	202 19 0	23 4 9	(Not stated)
1877	558 1 9	109 4 0	15 0 0	154 2 11	23 10 8	7 14 4
1878	620 17 8	127 10 0	15 0 0	191 14 8	22 4 3	Separate
1879	629 1 6	132 10 0	15 0 0	161 11 0	20 0 3	items not
1880	666 4 4	130 0 0	15 0 0	201 15 9	20 3 5	given in
1881	633 9 8	200 0 0	15 0 0	140 19 3	15 8 9	accounts
1882	710 5 7	200 0 0	15 0 0	200 17 0	16 12 2	10 0 0
1883	770 9 9	200 0 0	15 0 0	205 14 11	8 7 7	3 3 0
1884	766 8 4	200 0 0	15 0 0	269 6 6	7 10 10	
1885	768 7 11	200 0 0	15 0 0	192 0 4	16 8 2	
1886	698 7 4	200 0 0	15 0 0	224 9 10	17 5 9	
1887	625 3 5	200 0 0	15 0 0	196 15 1	22 4 6	
1888	742 18 6	200 0 0	15 0 0	171 14 0	31 12 8	
1889	802 15 3	200 0 0	15 0 0	266 6 9	28 19 2	
Totals	11,065 1 2	2,860 17 0	235 0 0	3,195 10 1	329 0 10	

NOTES.—(*a*) Income (col. 1) is exclusive of Delegates' Fees to Congress, and of the previous year's balance. It means net Income.

(*b*) The Secretary was paid no salary until 1872-3. The total amount so paid, inclusive of rent, office expenses, clerical assistance, etc., for the five years, 1871 to 1875 inclusive, was £460 17*s.*

(*c*) Rent was first allowed for the year 1876, on the election of the new Secretary.

(*d*) Allowance for clerical work was first made in 1877, when £20 16*s.* was voted to the Secretary.

(*e*) The Treasurer was allowed no expenses until 1874, increased to £15 in 1875.

(*f*) Members of the Parliamentary Committee are only paid for the time given, and their expenses.

Income and Expenditure, etc.

Parliamentary Committee from its first institution to the Congress in 1889.

detailed in the Annual Balance Sheets presented to Congress.

Printing, etc., inclusive of Reports.	Postages, Parcels, etc., etc.	Office Rent, Gas, Fuel, etc., etc.	Clerical Work, Office Help, etc., each year.	Total Expenditure each year.	Balances, including Surplus from Congress.
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
..	..	Office rent, gas, fuel, etc., were included in the Secretary's salary		Nil.	Nil.
3 2 6	4 7 10	up to the year 1876, and no		16 11 4	0 4 2
31 18 2	23 0 0	allowance was made for clerical		200 12 10	95 3 9
106 18 0	67 13 2	work until 1877, when a sum		393 19 4	163 9 2
103 15 3	53 19 8	was voted to the Secretary.		463 4 5	126 11 11
125 17 0	61 15 6			545 11 4	4 3 5
105 3 0	50 2 6	38 3 4	..	535 8 6	38 17 2
157 14 0	60 10 0	28 3 3	20 16 0	555 19 2	119 18 4
177 17 8	57 12 10	27 3 4	10 10 6	629 13 3	47 14 3
163 2 5	57 5 5	30 1 0	5 1 0	584 10 2	96 12 2
171 5 5	64 17 10	34 19 4	11 9 4	649 11 0	125 10 5
138 2 6	46 16 0	37 3 11	9 16 11	603 7 3	170 12 4
145 19 0	52 2 2	50 10 9	11 2 4	710 13 5	191 13 4
156 18 6	52 7 8	53 15 11	15 10 2	710 17 9	334 15 4
194 7 5	76 4 2	59 3 4	42 12 3*	885 4 6	226 15 4
224 17 10	53 17 6	56 10 10	30 17 9*	790 12 5	241 4 1
196 19 3	38 5 9	62 18 10	..	754 19 6	209 19 4
			Bank charges.		
156 2 7	46 12 11	63 6 0	1 0 0	700 15 6	170 1 8
193 11 2	39 0 10	63 10 0	1 0 0	715 8 10	160 2 11
280 12 0	40 16 11	76 6 8	1 0 0†	999 11 6	68 16 8
2,834 3 8	947 18 8	681 16 6	160 15 5	11,466 12 0	..

(*g*) Stationery and printing are included in the years where the items are not separately given in the Table.

(*h*) The Income includes sale of Reports since the year 1877, before which date they were issued as a private speculation. The sales now pay about two-thirds the entire cost of all the printing.

(*i*) During the years 1871 to 1875 all publications were circulated gratuitously by the Committee.

* In Office expenses, 1884 and 1885, these items include furniture, repairs, and sundries.

† The balance of £90 10*s.* in 1888-89 was for the expenses of the International Congress.

VII.—FOREIGN COMPETITION.

Abstract of Returns, showing the aggregate Exports from Foreign Countries of Manufactured Goods and Merchandise which are alleged to come into competition with British Goods. The amounts represent the total exports to all countries; those to the United Kingdom only being given separately, at the end, in each case.

(*a*) COTTON MANUFACTURES.—Aggregate Exported to all Countries.

Country.	1877.	1882.	1887.	1888.
AUSTRO-HUNGARY—				
Gulden (1/8)	7,077,000	7,889,000	7,849,000	7,081,000
Sterling	£589,750	£657,416	£654,083	£590,083
To the United Kingdom ..	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
BELGIUM—				
Francs..	17,408,000	22,597,000	20,809,000	19,974,000
Sterling	£696,320	£903,880	£824,360	£798,960
To the United Kingdom ..	£185,029	£540,301	£367,373	£414,116
FRANCE—				
Francs..	62,200,000	97,800,000	117,758,000	106,183,000
Sterling	£2,488,000	£3,912,000	£4,710,320	£4,247,320
To the United Kingdom ..	£762,698	£320,218	£480,072	£440,906
GERMANY—				
Marks	56,536,000	73,138,000	118,740,000	186,348,000
Sterling	£2,826,800	£3,656,900	£5,937,003	£9,317,400
To the United Kingdom ..	£189,874	£63,874	£193,648	£155,679
HOLLAND—				
Gulden (1/8)	15,097,000	15,805,000	25,247,000	27,456,000
Sterling	£1,424,750	£1,483,850	£2,103,917	£2,287,500
To the United Kingdom ..	£409,338	£873,556	£747,838	£940,752
UNITED STATES—				
Dollars	10,236,000	13,223,000	14,929,000	13,013,000
Sterling	£2,047,200	£2,646,600	£2,985,800	£2,602,600
To the United Kingdom ..	£163,238	£381,934	£452,437	£259,820

(*b*) Woollen Manufactures.—Aggregate Exported to all Countries.

Country.	1877.	1882.	1887.	1888.
Austro-Hungary—				
Gulden (1/8)	25,114,000	30,025,000	25,126,000	24,910,000
Sterling	£2,092,833	£2,502,083	£2,093,833	£2,075,833
To the United Kingdom ..	No Woollen articles enumerated as being exported to this country.			
Belgium—				
Francs..	34,195,000	30,380,000	23,450,000	25,346,000
Sterling	£1,367,800	£1,215,200	£938,000	£1,013,840
To the United Kingdom ..	£130,258	£136,341	£438,007	£476,639
France—				
Francs..	325,100,000	401,900,000	350,447,000	323,376,000
Sterling	£13,004,000	£16,076,000	£14,017,880	£12,935,040
To the United Kingdom ..	£3,606,831	£3,790,210	£4,912,892	£5,588,599
Germany—				
Marks	171,161,000	177,579,000	180,027,000	189,748,000
Sterling	£8,558,050	£8,878,950	£9,001,350	£9,487,400
To the United Kingdom ..	£425,650	£389,830	£572,570	£691,378
Holland—				
Gulden (1/8)	4,296,000	5,601,000	4,353,000	4,890,000
Sterling	£358,000	£466,750	£379,417	£407,500
To the United Kingdom ..	£894,791	£1,592,665	£1,612,471	£1,885,769

(*c*) Silk Manufactures.—Aggregate Exported to all Countries.

Country.	1877.	1882.	1887.	1888.
Austro-Hungary—				
Gulden (1/8)	9,161,000	10,418,000	18,317,000	19,666,000
Sterling	£763,416	£868,167	£1,526,417	£1,638,833
To the United Kingdom ..	None enumerated as being exported to this country.			
France—				
Francs..	259,200,000	289,548,000	209,807,000	223,171,000
Sterling	£10,368,000	£11,581,920	£8,392,280	£8,926,840
To the United Kingdom ..	£8,401,028	£7,120,141	£5,888,827	£6,067,387
Germany—				
Marks	70,300,000	169,953,000	195,851,000	183,436,000
Sterling	£3,515,000	£8,499,750	£9,792,550	£9,121,300
To the United Kingdom ..	Nil. No exports to this country enumerated.			
Italy—				
Lira	10,526,000	11,430,000	16,152,000	14,603,000
Sterling	£421,040	£457,200	£646,080	£584,120
To the United Kingdom ..	None enumerated as being exported to this country.			

(*d*) IRON AND STEEL MANUFACTURES.—Aggregate Exported to all Countries.

Country.	1877.	1882.	1887.	1888.
AUSTRO-HUNGARY				
Gulden (1/8)	18,447,000	16,709,000	14,678,000	11,439,000
Sterling	£1,573,250	£1,392,416	£1,223,666	£957,417
To the United Kingdom .. (Bars only.)	£4,733	£3,778	£257	£150
BELGIUM—				
Iron Sheets .. Francs	4,897,000	7,572,000	7,469,000	7,166,000
Iron and Steel Rails ,,	9,798,000	2,988,000	3,229,000	1,149,000
Wrought Iron, etc... ,,	32,802,000	35,473,000	28,376,000	30,724,000
Machinery .. .. ,,	65,620,000	77,386,000	40,431,000	28,155,000
Total .. .. .. ,,	113,117,000	123,419,000	79,505,000	67,194,000
,, ... Sterling	£4,524,680	£4,936,760	£3,180,200	£2,687,760
To the United Kingdom .. (Including Bar Iron.)	£557,346	£579,547	£624,803	£669,214
FRANCE—				
Metal Wares .. Francs	58,300,000	66,682,000	72,838,000	71,011,000
,, ,, .. Sterling	£2,332,000	£2,667,280	£2,913,520	£2,840,440
To the United Kingdom ..	£76,131	£127,124	£64,532	£94,441
GERMANY—				
Coarse Iron Wares. Marks	47,127,000	109,650,000	86,715,000	108,245,000
Railway Bars .. ,,	29,000,000	24,187,000	16,029,000	10,920,000
Machinery and Locomotives, etc. .. ,,	47,880,000	62,494 000	52,768,000	76,748,000
Total .. .. .. ,,	124,007,000	196,241,000	155,512,000	175,913,000
,, ... Sterling	£6,200,350	£9,812,050	£7,775,600	£8,795,650
To the United Kingdom ..	Nil.	Nil.	£253,910	£332,334
HOLLAND—				
Bars, Rods, etc. Gulden (1/8)	23,873,000	32,692,000	20,891,000	18,492,000
Other Wares .. ,,	10,300,000	31,453,000	25,422,000	25,858,000
Total .. .. ,,	34,173,000	64,145,003	46,313,000	44,350,000
,, ... Sterling	£2,847,750	£5,345,416	£3,859,417	£3,695,833
To the United Kingdom ..	£503,710	£1,100,498	£832,815	£924,283
UNITED STATES—				
Agri. Implements Dollars	1,816,000	2,976,000	2,138,000	2,645,000
Iron & Steel Manufact. ,,	11,076,328	10,312,000	8,261,000	0,154,000
Sewing Machines .. ,,	1,652,487	2,647,000	2,313,000	2,245,000
Machinery .. .. ,,	3,391,221	7,239,000	5,485,000	6,364,000
Total .. .. .. ,,	17,936,036	23,174,000	18,197,000	20,408,000
,, ... Sterling	£3,587,207	£4,634,800	£3,639,400	£4,081,600
To the United Kingdom ..	£200,006	£176,735	£1,771,677	£2,060,388

(*e*) MISCELLANEOUS MANUFACTURES. — Aggregate Exported to all Countries.

Country.	1877.	1882.	1887.	1888.
AUSTRO-HUNGARY—				
Leather Manufact. Gulden	17,484,000	21,210,000	23,909,000	25,059,000
,, ,, Sterling	£1,457,000	£1,767,500	£1,992,417	£2,088,250
To the United Kingdom ..	None enumerated as being exported to this country.			
Glass of all kinds. Gulden	13,645,000	20,148,000	20,441,000	17,025,000
,, ,, Sterling	£1,303,750	£1,679,000	£1,703,417	£1,418,750
To the United Kingdom ..	None enumerated as being exported to this country.			
Paper Manufact. Gulden	9,625,000	7,909,000	12,681,000	14,099,000
,, ,, Sterling	£802,083	£659,083	£1,056,750	£1,174,917
To the United Kingdom ..	£53,488	£30,021	£19,926	£23,218
FRANCE—				
Paper Manufact. Francs	52,600,000	52,297,000	44,961,000	43,258,000
,, ,, Sterling	£2,104,000	£2,091,880	£1,798,440	£1,730,320
To the United Kingdom ..	£213,036	£336,983	£180,842	£127,615

The foregoing five series of examples are but specimens of the course of trade in the articles which come into direct competition with British exports. They are the chief articles of manufacture, and have not been "selected" to build up a theory, but to emphasize a fact. Had any other example presented itself of sufficient importance to be added, the figures would have been given. The growth of foreign exports is a factor to be taken into account, but there is no reason for the panic and alarm which occasionally manifest themselves when a decline occurs in the vast totals of our export trade.

VIII.—LIST OF BOOKS AND AUTHORITIES

CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS WORK, AND ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECTS DEALT WITH.

"English Gilds," edited for the Early English Text Society, by Toulmin Smith, Esq., with an Essay on the History and Development of Guilds, by Dr. Brentano.—Trübner & Co., 1870, 21*s*.

Article on the above, by J. M. Ludlow, Esq. *Fortnightly Review*, October, 1869.

City of London Livery Companies.—Reports of Royal Commission, 1884. Reports and Appendices, as follows:

Vol. I. c.–4073.—Reports and Memoranda, 366 pages, 3*s*. 10*d*.

Vol. II. c.–4073–I.—Reports and Memoranda, Returns and Correspondence, 830 pages, 8*s*. 8*d*.

Vol. III. c.–4073–II.—Reports and Memoranda, Returns and Correspondence, 872 pages, 9*s*.

Vol. IV. c.–4073–III.—Reports and Memoranda, Returns and Correspondence, 640 pages, 6*s*. 8*d*.

Other Parliamentary Reports.

"Artisans and Machinery."—Six Reports of Select Committee on Emigration of Artisans; the Exportation of Tools and Machinery, and on Combinations of Workmen to raise Wages, 1824; and Report on Labourers' Wages, 1824.

Combinations.—Report of Select Committee on the Combination Laws, 1825.

Combinations.—Report of Mr. Nassau Senior and Mr. Tomlinson to Lord Melbourne, 1832.

Combinations and Extent of Trade Unions.—Report of Select Committee, 1838.

The Organisation and Rules of Trade Unions.—Reports of the Royal Commission in 1867. Eleven Reports, 1867 to 1869, inclusive.

Reports of the Inquiry into the Outrages at Sheffield and Manchester.—Three Reports, 1867–68.

Reports of the Royal Commission to Inquire into the Laws affecting Labour.—Three Reports, 1874–75.

The Trial of the five Cabinet-makers, and the Recorder's charge in reference thereto, 1875.

Master and Servant.—Two Reports of Select Committees in 1865 and 1866 respectively.

Reports of Cases under the Master and Servant Acts, 1867–74.

The Laws of Master and Servant in Foreign Countries, 1875.

Foreign Office Papers.

I.—Industrial Questions and Trade Unions abroad. II.—The Condition of the Industrial Classes in Foreign Countries. III.—Further Reports, and on the Purchasing Power of Money. IV.—Further Reports, 1872. The four preceding Reports, issued by the Foreign Office, give a good deal of valuable information as to the condition of the working classes abroad from 1867 to 1872.

Courts of Conciliation.—Reports of Select Committees in 1856 and 1860 respectively.

"Industrial Conciliation," by Henry Crompton, 1876.

"Sliding Scales and other Methods of Wage Arrangement;" and "The Position and Prospects of Industrial Conciliation"—by L. L. Price, M.A. *Statistical Society's Journal*, 1887 and 1890.

The Factory System, Reports and Legislation.

Report of Select Committee, 1816.

Reports of Royal Commissions, 1832, 1841–43, 1862–66, and 1874–76.

"Linen Trade."—Reports of Inquiries, 1822–25.

"Silk Trades."—Reports of Inquiries, 1823–32.

"Handloom Weavers."—Reports of Inquiries, 1839–41.

"Framework Knitters."—Reports of Inquiries, 1845.

"Bleaching Works."—Reports of Inquiries, 1855, 1857–58.

"Lace Manufactures."—Reports of Inquiries, 1861.

"Print-Works."—Reports of Inquiries, 1869.

Mines and Collieries.

Reports of Royal Commissions, 1842, 1843, and 1867.

Accidents in Mines.—Reports of Royal Commissions, 1880–86.

Payment of Wages.—Reports of Inquiries, 1842, 1854, and 1873.

Stoppages of Wages, and the Truck System, 1855 and 1874.

The Truck System.—Report of Select Committee, 1867.

Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture.—Reports of Inquiries, 1867 to 1871.

The Sweating System.

Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, 1888-90.—Five volumes Reports and Evidence, and four volumes of Indexes.

Laws affecting the hours of Adult Labour in Foreign Countries.—Foreign Office Paper (commercial) c.-5866, 1889.

Arthur's "History of the Factory Movement," two volumes, 1857.

"English Factory Legislature," by E. E. Von Plener, 1873.

Friendly Societies.

Reports of the Royal Commission, 1870 to 1874. Twelve Reports.

Annual Reports of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, 1826, 1827, 1852, 1854, 1855, and subsequently down to 1890.

Trade Unions.

Reports of the Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade, Vol. I., 1887; Vol. II., 1888; Vol. III., 1889.

Strikes.

Report upon, by the Labour Correspondent to the Board of Trade, 1889.

Wages.

Return of Wages, 1830 to 1886, c.-5172, price 4*s.* 8*d.*

Return—Rates of Wages in Belgium, 1888, c.-5269, price 1*s.*

Return—Rates of Wages in Textile Trades, 1889, c.-5807, price 1*s.* 6*d.*

Co-operative Societies.

Reports of the Registrar of Friendly Societies on Provident Societies.

Annual Reports of the twenty-two Co-operative Congresses, 1869 to 1890.

The Co-operative Annual, 1873 to 1890, eight volumes.

"History of Co-operation," by G. J. Holyoake. Vol. I., 1875; Vol. II., 1879.

"Profit-Sharing," by Professor Sedley Taylor, 1884.

Depression in Trade.

Reports of the Royal Commission, 1886-87, five volumes, 1,724 pages, 19*s.* 11*d.*

Report on Depression in Trade in France, 1886, being Extracts from the Reports of the French Commission.

"Trade Societies and Strikes."—Report of the Social Science Association, 1860.

Two Articles on the above by J. M. Ludlow, in *Macmillan's Magazine*, February and March, 1861.

Wade's "History of the Middle and Working Classes," 1833.

The Pioneer, a Trade Union Newspaper, and Organ of the National Consolidated Trades, 1833–34.

The Labour League, Journal of the National Association of United Trades, 1848–49.

"Work and Wages, 1872;" "Trade Unions and Cost of Labour;" "Wages in 1873;" "Wages in 1877;" "Labour at Home and Abroad;" and "Foreign Work and English Wages, 1879"—by Lord Brassey.

"The Progress of Industry," a Review of Lord Brassey's "Work and Wages," by Frederic Harrison. *Fortnightly Review.*

"Six Centuries of Work and Wages," by Professor J. E. Thorold Rogers. Two volumes, 1884.

"Fluctuations in Wages," by Professor Foxwell.

"The Law of Criminal Conspiracies and Agreements," by R. S. Wright, 1873.

"Handy-Book of the Labour Laws," by George Howell, 1876.

Articles in Reviews.

"The Limits of Political Economy," by Frederic Harrison. *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1865.

"The Ironmasters' Trade Union," by Frederic Harrison. *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1865.

"The Ironmaster's View of Strikes," by W. E. Hooper. *Fortnightly Review*, August, 1865.

"The Good and Evil of Trades Unionism," by Frederic Harrison. *Fortnightly Review*, November, 1865.

"Industrial Co-operation," by Frederic Harrison. *Fortnightly Review* January, 1866.

"The Peasants' War, 1381," by J. E. Thorold Rogers. *Fortnightly Review*, February, 1886.

"The Laws of Combination in France," by Francis D. Longe. In two parts. *Fortnightly Review*, August and September, 1867.

"Thornton on Labour and its Claims," by John Stuart Mill. In two parts. *Fortnightly Review*, May and June, 1867.

"Political Economy in Germany," by Gustav Cohn. *Fortnightly Review*, September, 1873.

"History of German Political Economy," by T. E. Cliffe Leslie *Fortnightly Review*, July, 1875.

Sundry Articles by the Author.

"Picketing." *Contemporary Review*, September, 1877.
"Apprentices." *Contemporary Review*, October, 1877.
"The International." *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1878.
"Trade Unions." *Fraser's Magazine*, January, 1879.
"The Cost of Strikes." *Fraser's Magazine*, December, 1879.
"Trade Unions." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1882.
"Trade Unions." *Contemporary Review*, September, 1883.
"The State of Trade." *Fortnightly Review*, February, 1887.
"Fluctuations in Trade." *Fortnightly Review*, April, 1887.
"Trade Union Congresses." *Contemporary Review*, September, 1889.
"Trade Unions." *Co-operative Annual*, 1885.
"History of Great Strikes." *Co-operative Annual*, 1889.
"Fluctuations in Trade. *Co-operative Annual*, 1890.

Annual Reports of the Trades Union Congresses, 1868 to 1889 inclusive, and the Annual Reports of the Parliamentary Committees, 1872 to 1889 inclusive.

Annual Reports of Trade Unions: Engineers, Steam-engine Makers, Boiler-makers and Iron-shipbuilders, Ironfounders, Ironmoulders, Carpenters and Joiners, Masons, Bricklayers, Plasterers, Shipwrights, Compositors, various bodies of Miners, Iron and Steel Workers, Tailors, Boot and Shoe Makers, and various others, during the last thirty years. Also the Reports of Strikes at Preston, in London, at Newcastle, in Lancashire, and other places and of the chief labour prosecutions during the century.

CHARLES DICKENS AND EVANS, CRYSTAL PALACE PRESS.

HD6664 .H85
The conflicts of capital and labour,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 1233